

the affairs of Indians as conducted by said bureau, its branches and agencies. Said committee is hereby authorized to employ such clerical and other assistance, including stenographers, as said committee may deem necessary in the proper prosecution of its work: *Provided*, That stenographers so employed shall not receive for their services exceeding \$1 per printed page."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the amendments of the Senate numbered 48, 80, 95, and 111.

HENRY F. ASHURST,

H. L. MYERS,

MOSES E. CLAPP,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

JOHN H. STEPHENS,

C. D. CARTER,

P. D. NORTON,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I wish to say that the conferees have not agreed on all the amendments. There are four amendments which are still in dispute.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to make a suggestion to the Senator from Arizona. He does not intend, I presume, to ask that the conference report be printed as a Senate document, but that it be printed for the use of the committee and to be placed on the desks for the information of the Senate.

Mr. ASHURST. That is satisfactory.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 14074. An act granting the consent of Congress to the village of Fox Lake, in the county of Lake, State of Illinois, to construct a bridge across both arms of the Fox River where it connects Pistakee Lake and Nippersink Lake, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in the county of Lake, State of Illinois;

H. R. 17602. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county commissioners of Polk County, Minn., and Grand Forks County, N. Dak., to construct a bridge across Red River of the North on the boundary line between said States;

H. R. 17710. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Tallapoosa River, separating the counties of Montgomery and Elmore, in the State of Alabama, at a point somewhere between Judkin Ferry and Hughes Ferry;

H. R. 18529. An act granting the consent of Congress to the police jury of Rapides Parish, La., to construct a bridge across Red River at or near Boyce, La.;

H. R. 18534. An act to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the St. Francis River at or near Parkin, Ark.;

H. R. 18550. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Montgomery, in the State of Tennessee, to construct a bridge across the Cumberland River;

H. R. 18551. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Montgomery, in the State of Tennessee, to construct a bridge across the Cumberland River;

H. R. 18720. An act permitting the building of a railroad bridge across the Mississippi River at Bemidji, in the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 18725. An act granting the consent of Congress to Kratka Township, Pennington County, Minn., to construct a bridge across Red Lake River;

H. R. 19239. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Pearl River, Miss., and the fourth ward of the parish of Washington, La., to construct a bridge across Pearl River between Pearl River County, Miss., and Washington Parish, La.;

H. R. 19298. An act authorizing the Western New York & Pennsylvania Railway Co. to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River, in the town of Allegany, county of Cattaraugus, N. Y.; and

H. R. 20574. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county commissioners of Decatur County, Ga., to reconstruct a bridge across the Flint River at Bainbridge, Ga.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. RANDELL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14777) to provide for the control of the floods of the Mississippi River and of the Sacramento River, Cal., and for other purposes.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. RANDELL. I yield.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement regarding the railroad legislation. There are three bills to which the President has called special attention in a message. One is the bill enlarging the Interstate Commerce Commission from seven to nine members, and providing that it shall be divided into three divisions, each of which will have jurisdiction over the subjects that now belong to the entire commission.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. OVERMAN. I will state to the Senator if he yields to me I shall move to adjourn or to take a recess, because I know the Senator can not get his bill up this afternoon. I move that we take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. RANDELL. I hope the Senator will not insist on that motion. We can get the bill up, and then I propose to ask that it be laid aside and that the Senate proceed with the consideration of these emergency measures.

Mr. OVERMAN. I know the Senator can not possibly get the bill up this afternoon.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Certainly we can not get it up if the Senate will not permit it to be taken up, but I do not think the mere statement of the Senator from North Carolina settles the question.

Mr. OVERMAN. All right; I will withdraw the motion.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana yielded to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], and he now has the floor. Does the Senator from Nevada now yield to some other Senator; and if so, to whom?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I propose to continue the remarks I was making.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. THOMAS. My understanding is that the so-called water-power bill is the unfinished business. I have no desire to retain that bill before the Senate, but I am a member of the Committee on Public Lands, and the chairman of the committee is not here. In his behalf I make the inquiry.

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. RANDELL. I hope the Senator will not make that motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina moves that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. RANDELL. I ask the Senator to withdraw the motion and move a recess. I will accept that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m., Friday, February 9, 1917) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, February 10, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, February 9, 1917.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, who art supremely wise, all-powerful, the essence of whose being is love, quicken all that is purest, noblest, best in us, and help us to eliminate the evil tendencies which lie in wait to destroy; that the trend of our life may be forward not backward, upward not downward, heavenward not hellward; that we may build for ourselves from within a character which shall be an everlasting memorial to our Maker, through Him who taught us the way and the truth and the life. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. LANGLEY rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. LANGLEY. To ask unanimous consent to address the House for not exceeding five minutes in order that I may explain and modify a statement I made in debate yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to address the House for not exceeding five minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his request for a moment?

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this is pension day, and I ask unanimous consent that two pension bills on the Private Calendar, one a Senate bill from the Committee on Invalid Pensions and one a House bill from the Committee on Pensions, be considered in order and taken up following the completion of the naval appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that a Senate private pension bill from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and also a House bill from the Committee on Pensions, be taken up immediately following the conclusion of the consideration of the naval appropriation bill. Is there objection?

Mr. KITCHIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman from Missouri that it was understood the other day, or rather the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. RAUCH] gave notice, that immediately after the conclusion of the naval appropriation bill he would ask for the consideration of the pension appropriation bill. It will take not more than an hour and a half or two hours, if that. I suggest that the gentleman from Missouri make his request to follow that bill. I understand the gentleman from Missouri thinks it will take only half an hour to dispose of his bills.

Mr. SHERWOOD. It will take about 22 minutes to pass the two bills.

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, we can stay here an hour later if necessary.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Well, I will change the request and ask that these private pension bills be taken up following the consideration of the pension appropriation bill.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to suggest to the gentleman from Missouri, as well as to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], that there is no objection to the consideration of these bills, but there is some difficulty in making an agreement in advance. It is just as easy to take up these bills after the pension appropriation bill is passed or after the naval appropriation bill is passed as it is now, but why make this advance agreement?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Because this is pension day, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. They are in order at any time.

Mr. GARNER. I know they are in order.

Mr. KITCHIN. I think there will be no objection. We can stay here an hour or two later if necessary.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman believe that in spite of the effort of any man it would take more than half a day?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; and it will not take half a night.

Mr. MANN. They could be considered now while waiting for Members to come in.

Mr. GARNER. I have no objection.

Mr. MANN. Why not read them now?

Mr. KITCHIN. That would be perfectly satisfactory to me. If the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] in charge of the naval appropriation bill would prefer that course, all right. But if he prefers to go on with the naval bill, very well.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would prefer that the matter be disposed of now rather than to break into it at 5 o'clock this afternoon, because I can not forecast as to the time. If it will not take more than 20 minutes I shall not object.

Mr. MANN. It will be in order at any time to move to defer it. I suggest that the gentleman from Missouri ask to consider those bills in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] asked unanimous consent to proceed for not exceeding five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for five minutes.

THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, acting wholly upon my own initiative and in obedience to a sense of justice, I am making this statement for the RECORD.

Yesterday while the House was debating some of the Senate amendments to the legislative bill I had an understanding with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], who had charge of the time, that I was to have five minutes in opposition to the amendment proposing to classify postmasters. I hurriedly proceeded to arrange in my mind the points I would endeavor to cover in that time. At the last moment the gentleman from Tennessee informed me that owing to encroachments upon his time by those who had preceded me he could only yield me a minute and a half and I then had less time than that remaining

in which to think of something to say in that minute and a half. [Laughter.]

It occurred to me that I could cite my experience as appointment clerk of the Census Office in helping to organize that office independent of the civil service as an illustration of how easily a high standard of efficiency can be obtained without competitive examination. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] had both just spoken in support of the Senate amendment. I recalled that they had both submitted, along with other Members of Congress, their recommendations to fill the quotas allotted to them in that office; and, speaking in a spirit of badinage and, of course, hastily, I used language which was calculated to place those two gentlemen in a false position. The reporters' notes, which are usually correct, show that I said these two gentlemen were among those who made the most consistent appeals for patronage. After thinking the matter over I regretted that I used the language that I did, and would gladly have recalled it. The facts are that we made an allotment of Census Office appointments to each Senator and Representative and notified each of the number allotted to him and requested him to submit a list of recommendations. Both of the gentlemen named did this and my recollection is that the quota allotted in each instance was filled, but if I am in error as to that the records of the Census Office will show it. However, that is neither here nor there. I want to frankly, and in this public manner, say that as I now recall it there was no effort whatever on the part of either gentleman named to get more appointments than the bureau had requested them to ask for, and both of them were always courteous and considerate in their dealing with the bureau in these matters.

During my 10 years of service in this body I have never intentionally misrepresented or otherwise done an injustice to any of my fellow Members. I have always been scrupulously careful on that point, and I can not, in justice to my own sense of fairness and in justice to the two gentlemen referred to, permit this incident to pass without putting this statement in the RECORD. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman permit me to say what I said to him privately yesterday, but not publicly, that he did not hurt my feelings any? [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGLEY. I am very glad, indeed, to have my friend say that publicly.

Mr. Speaker, having made this explanation and not having had the opportunity to express myself fully yesterday on the question, I ask unanimous consent that I may state briefly in the RECORD my reasons for opposing the proposition to classify postmasters and my views on civil service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Niagara power bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the Niagara power bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had, on February 8, 1917, approved and signed bills of the following titles:

H. R. 1024. An act for the relief of Allen M. Hiller;

H. R. 6145. An act for the relief of Edward F. McDermott, alias James Williams;

H. R. 8057. An act for the relief of the legal representatives of Napoleon B. Giddings;

H. R. 8267. An act to place Bernard A. Schaaf on the retired list of the Army;

H. R. 217. An act to authorize the sale of school property in the city of Denver, Colo., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3238. An act for the relief of Sarah E. Elliott;

H. R. 8452. An act for the relief of Charles L. Moore;

H. R. 9547. An act authorizing the acceptance by the United States Government from the Kenesaw Memorial Association of Illinois of a proposed gift of land on the Kenesaw battle field in the State of Georgia;

H. R. 12240. An act for the relief of John Brodie;

H. R. 12742. An act for the relief of Gottlob Schlect and Maurice D. Higgins and for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of Valentine Brasch;

H. R. 13106. An act for the relief of the trustee and parties who are now or who may hereafter become interested in the estate of James A. Chamberlain under the terms of his will;
 H. R. 13820. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Buttner;
 H. R. 14572. An act for the relief of Gertie Foss;
 H. R. 14645. An act for the relief of the legal representative of P. H. Aylett;
 H. R. 14822. An act to prevent and punish the desecration, mutilation, or improper use, within the District of Columbia, of the flag of the United States of America; and
 H. R. 14978. An act for the relief of Ida Turner.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 7833. An act authorizing the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 7433. An act for the relief of Winfield S. Solomon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 7598. An act for the relief of John H. Kidd; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 6430. An act directing the reexamination of the accounts of the late Peter G. S. Ten Broeck; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 6251. An act for the relief of John F. Kelly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 5648. An act for the relief of Fast Walker, D. K. How, and Not Afraid of Bear; to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 5768. An act for the relief of Frank Carpenter; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 5617. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States district court for the district of Minnesota to hear, try, and determine the value of certain pine timber; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3180. An act to authorize the appointment of Clarence C. Kress to the grade of captain, United States Army Medical Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 747. An act for the relief of Wilbur F. Lawton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3507. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Marsh Watkins; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 6854. An act to repeal the last proviso of section 4 of an act to establish the Rocky Mountain National Park, in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes, approved January 26, 1915; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 378. An act to provide for the appointment of a district judge in the middle and eastern judicial districts in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 5632) for the relief of Aquila Nebeker.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 19359. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 378. An act to provide for the appointment of a district judge in the middle and eastern judicial districts in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes.

GUILFORD COURTHOUSE BATTLE FIELD.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8229) to establish a national military park at the battle field of Guilford Courthouse with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8229) to establish a national military park at the battle field of Guilford Courthouse.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to take the bill from the Speaker's table, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER announced as the conferees on the part of the House Mr. DENT, Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina, and Mr. KAHN.

PENSIONS.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up pension bills on the Private Calendar and consider first the bill S. 7486 in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to take up pension bills on the Private Calendar and take up first the bill S. 7486 and consider the same in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (S. 7486) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

Mr. SHERWOOD. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Celia A. Blodgett, widow of Benjamin F. Blodgett, late of Company F, First Regiment United States Volunteer Sharpshooters, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William W. Olmsted, late of Company K, Twenty-first Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Hendrickson, late of Independent Battery H, Pennsylvania Volunteer Light Artillery, and Company C, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Aaron C. Rodocker, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John J. Schlessmann, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard Mitchell, late of Company G, Seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Blanche F. Nash, widow of Guy T. Nash, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Vermont Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John Mayfield, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Prine, late of Company G, Thirtieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Jarrett, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Richey, late of Company M, Twenty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary P. Ross, widow of Henry S. Ross, late of Company E, Eighty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Isaac R. Johnson, late of Company B, Thirty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Columbus Walton, late of Company B, One hundred and thirty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sada Gleeson, widow of William J. Gleeson, late of Company C, Fortieth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Severn L. Parks, late of Company A, Eighty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month, the same to be paid him without deduction or rebate on account of former alleged erroneous payments or overpayments of pension.

The name of Ellen Rush, widow of Ebenezer C. Rush, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George A. Blöse, late of Company C, Second Battalion Pennsylvania Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Lander, widow of David D. Lander, late of Company H, Forty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George D. Smith, late of Company K, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. Crocker, late of Company A, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and Seventh Independent Battery Wisconsin Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter Sheplar, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of La Fayette Platt, late of Company H, One hundred and Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cornelius T. Ham, late of Seventh Company, unassigned, Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph C. Patterson, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mathias Eyer, late of Company D, Two hundred and tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Emily P. Hubbard, widow of George M. Hubbard, late first lieutenant and quartermaster, Seventy-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William H. Cleland, late of Company F, One hundred and thirty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James K. Wesley, late of Company I, Forty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry M. Bryant, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel D. Sherman, late of Company K, Ninety-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elmore Y. Chase, late surgeon United States Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John E. Madison, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment, and Company K, Second Regiment, New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Elliott, late of Company K, Eighteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William C. Pope, late of Company B, Twenty-fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Leona B. Hauke, widow of Albert Hauke, late of Company D, Fifty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jacob W. Perkins, alias William West, late of Company L, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Levi J. Richardson, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and Company B, First Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Niels Attleson, late of Company E, Twelfth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick A. Churchill, late topographical engineer, captain, and volunteer aid-de-camp to Gen. McClellan and Gen. A. E. Burnside, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of James B. Thornton, late of Company H, Fifteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John N. McClure, late of Company A, Eighty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James T. Pigott, late of Company F, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas J. Harrison, late of Company D, Sixteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry H. Niles, late of U. S. S. *Moose*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ephraim Smith, late of Company I, Two hundred and seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edgar P. Lewis, late of Company K, Sixty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Solomon Terpenning, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Reed, late of Company A, Thirty-third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John C. Cook, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph A. Miller, late of Company D, Third Regiment, Potomac Home Brigade, Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Stouffer, late of Capt. Sanno's independent company, Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James S. Sisson, late of Company B, One hundred and ninety-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Unferfate, late of Company B, One hundred and eighty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George R. Gibney, late of Company B, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George M. Kimble, late of Company K, Sixty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles N. Chatto, late of U. S. S. *Nipsic*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Wylie Brown, late of Company A, Forty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles Asa Clark, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edwin D. Sweet, late of Company D, Twenty-sixth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George O. Whitman, late of Company K, Twenty-second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alexander Faries, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Seventh Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$21 per month.

The name of Thomas B. Williams, late of Company K, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lemuel Evans, late of Company D, First Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Walker, late of Company G, Twenty-second Regiment, and Company G, Twenty-ninth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Bradley, late of Company G, First Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and medical cadet, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles R. Stuart, late of Company H, Sixtieth Regiment Massachusetts Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eliakim Byard, late of Company D, Twenty-sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jasper Trimble, late of Company A, Nineteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George G. Tuell, late of Company A, First Battalion Maine Volunteer Sharpshooters, and Company A, Twentieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Matilda A. Bickford, widow of George H. Bickford, late of Company K, Twentieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and Twenty-third Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Bailey Mitchell, late of U. S. S. *Huron*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert H. Keller, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sylvester Clark, late of the Seventh Battery Indiana Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Ward, late of Company D, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis J. Cousens, late of Companies H and F, Thirtieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Simon Ridenour, late of Company G, One hundred and eleventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jefferson Focannon, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Angella T. Mosier, widow of Byron Mosier, late of Company G, Thirtieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nathan J. Way, late of Company I, Engineers of the West, Missouri Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Enoch Jones, late of the United States Marine Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Torrance, late of Companies F and D, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Gilmore, late of Company A, Seventy-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. Love, late of Company F, Tenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin Tackitt, late of Company B, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Grace Elizabeth Brown, helpless and dependent daughter of Thomas E. Brown, late of U. S. S. *Vermont*, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Boadicea T. Dinsmore, former widow of Sewell C. Gray, late captain Company A, Sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Henry B. Burgh, late lieutenant colonel Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ephraim J. Allen, late of Company C, Seventy-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edwin Rogers, late of Company G, Fortieth Regiment, and Company A, First Regiment, Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Banghart, late of Company A, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lucy E. Sturdevant, widow of Marcus Sturdevant, late of Company I, Nineteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Toyger Peterson, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Royal E. Dake, late commissary sergeant First Regiment New York Veteran Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick W. Mase, late of Company D, Thirty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ruth A. McMillan, widow of Jonathan H. McMillan, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment, and captain Company K, Twenty-third Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Wright, widow of William H. Wright, late captain Company C, Fifth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John Lamberson, late of Company D, Twenty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank T. Bolton, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frances I. Wallace, widow of William A. Wallace, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment New York State Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Edward Neugent, late captain Company A, One hundred and seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jeremiah B. Davis, late of Company E, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John S. Stearns, late of Companies D and B, Forty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry W. Gash, late of Company A, Sixteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ferdinand Davis, late of Company K, First Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Cooper, late of Company D, One hundred and fourteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Hudson, late of Company E, Twenty-third Regiment, and unassigned, Twenty-ninth Regiment, Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Dalton Selby, late of Company E, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John L. Fisher, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew M. Vanover, late of Company H, Sixty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis Mensch, late of Company G, One hundred and seventy-second Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Hollday, late of Company I, Thirty-ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Horace N. Holbrook, late of Company A, Sixteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert F. Hedrick, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Calvin Sharpnack, late of Company C, First Battalion Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles E. Collins, late of Company D, Twenty-first Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John R. Sparrow, late of Company I, Sixteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Reynold D. W. Campbell, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Treat, late of Company E, Nineteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Louisa A. Atherton, widow of Daniel W. Atherton, late of Company B, Ninety-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ezekiel P. Rowell, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Aura V. Thurston, widow of James H. Thurston, late of Company A, Twenty-ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Henry G. Mitchell, late of Company A, Twenty-ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Sperry, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Luther B. Johnson, late of Company C, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward F. Griswold, late captain Company F, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry H. Frampton, late of Company I, Sixty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William F. Wilson, late of Company H, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Edgar Mason, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jonas H. Upton, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Galbreath, late of Company K, Second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Cook, late of Battery B, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$21 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph S. Morgan, late of Company B, Twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Watkin Countryman, late of Company A, Thirty-third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anna E. Tenney, helpless and dependent daughter of Samuel Tenney, late of Company D, Maine Volunteer Coast Guards, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Theodore Gerrish, late of Company H, Twentieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles P. Betts, late of Company I, Twenty-sixth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William R. Browning, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jennie Jamison, now Beamer, late nurse, Medical Department, United States Volunteers, and widow of Marion Beamer, late of Company A, Forty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Crandell, widow of David Crandell, late of Company K, Thirty-sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles Washington, late of Company K, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hugh Stevens, late of Company D, Thirty-third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Adna H. Bowen, late second lieutenant Company F, Fifteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and major, Sixth Regiment, United States Colored Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Paul Strause, late of Company K, Forty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John L. Skinner, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Nally, late of Company C, Sixth Battalion District of Columbia Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$21 per month.

The name of Andrew Goodwin, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Thompson, late of Company H, Seventy-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob R. Stillwagon, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William S. Rowe, late of Company D, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas L. Irwin, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$21 per month.

The name of Maurice M. Kaighn, late of Company F, One hundred and ninety-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Stephen P. Colby, late second lieutenant Company F, Fifteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Job Wilbur, late of Company A, Twenty-ninth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Minnie J. Hodge, widow of Allen T. Hodge, late of Company C, First Battalion Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Martin Pool, late of Company C, Forty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret Stevenson, widow of Grandson F. Stevenson, late of Company A, Thirty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Samuel C. Clossin, late of Company B, Second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac R. Atlee, late of Company E, Forty-fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Brown, late of Company D, Fifteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John R. Simpson, late of Company G, First Regiment New York Volunteer Marine Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Theodore Longfellow, late of Company G, Fifty-seventh Regiment, and Company G, Fifty-ninth Regiment, Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Kate M. White, widow of Henry A. White, late of Company C, Sixteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and

pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Joseph C. Predmore, late of Company G, Eighty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James S. White, late of Company H, Twenty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Josephine E. Ure, widow of William Ure, late of Company H, One hundred and fortieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William Beauchamp, late unassigned, Thirty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mettie Sanders, widow of Henry Sanders, late of Company H, Forty-second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sidney M. Smith, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Chapman, late of Company C, Forty-ninth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John C. Mayer, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William F. Wahl, late of Company G, First Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Stevens, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Timothy Welch, late of Company H, Thirtieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles F. Smith, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Maybury, late of Company D, Second Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Moses E. Lowell, late of Company A, Twenty-seventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and Battery E, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Levi G. Foss, late of Company G, Thirty-first Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ida M. Paine, widow of Joseph C. Paine, late of Company B, First Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George F. Boothby, late of Company E, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas King, late first lieutenant Company F, Ninety-second Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anna C. Stahel, widow of John Stahel, late captain Company K, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Reason D. Evensizer, late of Company G, One hundred and ninety-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles F. Penley, late of Company C, Seventeenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Barber B. Durgin, late of Company K, Twelfth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following bills reported from the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

S. 365. Cella A. Blodgett.	S. 4734. Jacob W. Perkins.
S. 1190. William W. Olmsted.	S. 4747. Levi J. Richardson.
S. 1629. John W. Hendrickson.	S. 4753. Neils Attleson.
S. 1754. Aaron C. Rodocker.	S. 4847. Frederick A. Churchill.
S. 1761. John J. Schlessmann.	S. 4904. James B. Thornton.
S. 1762. Richard Mitchell.	S. 4959. John N. McClure.
S. 2210. Blanche F. Nash.	S. 4994. James T. Piggott.
S. 2280. John Mayfield.	S. 5034. Thomas J. Harrison.
S. 2571. William W. Prine.	S. 5154. Henry H. Niles.
S. 2572. John H. Jarrett.	S. 5252. Ephraim Smith.
S. 2616. William Richey.	S. 5357. Edgar P. Lewis.
S. 2739. Mary P. Ross.	S. 5363. Solomon Terpenning.
S. 2942. Isaac R. Johnson.	S. 5409. Charles Reed.
S. 2946. Columbus Walton.	S. 5530. John C. Cook.
S. 3014. Sada Gleeson.	S. 5557. Joseph A. Miller.
S. 3123. Severn L. Parks.	S. 5662. John Stouffer.
S. 3204. Ellen Rush.	S. 5714. James S. Sisson.
S. 3282. George A. Blose.	S. 5804. John Unterfate.
S. 3300. Elizabeth Lander.	S. 5812. George R. Gibney.
S. 3321. George D. Smith.	S. 5877. George M. Kimble.
S. 3326. William J. Crocker.	S. 5997. Charles N. Chatto.
S. 3576. Peter Sheplar.	S. 6003. Wylie Brown.
S. 3632. La Fayette Platt.	S. 6060. Charles Asa Clark.
S. 3688. Cornelius T. Ham.	S. 6064. Louis A. Allor.
S. 3725. Joseph C. Patterson.	S. 6171. Edwin D. Sweet.
S. 3914. Mathias Eyer.	S. 6173. George O. Whitman.
S. 4005. Emily P. Hubbard.	S. 6174. Alexander Faries.
S. 4150. William H. Cleland.	S. 6175. Thomas B. Williams.
S. 4291. James K. Wesley.	S. 6196. Lemuel Evans.
S. 4393. Henry M. Bryant.	S. 6238. John Walker.
S. 4395. Samuel D. Sherman.	S. 6253. William H. Bradley.
S. 4652. Elmore Y. Chase.	S. 6268. Charles R. Stuart.
S. 4678. John E. Madison.	S. 6271. Eliakim Byard.
S. 4685. John Elliott.	S. 6307. Jasper Trimble.
S. 4696. William C. Pope.	S. 6340. George G. Tuell.
S. 4714. Leona B. Haucke.	S. 6341. Matilda A. Bickford.

S. 6345. Bailey Mitchell.	S. 6809. William F. Willson.
S. 6365. Robert H. Keller.	S. 6838. Charles Edgar Mason.
S. 6367. Sylvester Clark.	S. 6860. Jonas H. Upton.
S. 6386. George W. Ward.	S. 6861. David Galbreath.
S. 6394. Francis J. Cousens.	S. 6871. John Cook.
S. 6399. Simon Ridenour.	S. 6876. Joseph S. Morgan.
S. 6403. Jefferson Focannon.	S. 6879. Watkin Countryman.
S. 6413. Angella T. Mosier.	S. 6899. Anna E. Tenney.
S. 6418. Nathan J. Way.	S. 6907. Theodore Gerrish.
S. 6419. Enoch Jones.	S. 6915. Charles P. Betts.
S. 6420. John W. Torrance.	S. 6940. William R. Browning.
S. 6438. Charles Almsworth.	S. 6945. Jennie Jamison Beamer.
S. 6442. Charles Gilmore.	S. 6959. Mary J. Crandell.
S. 6456. William J. Love.	S. 6967. Charles Washington.
S. 6457. Benjamin Tackitt.	S. 6984. Hugh Stevens.
S. 6458. Grace Elizabeth Brown.	S. 6987. Adna H. Bowen.
S. 6474. Boadicea E. Dinsmore.	S. 6997. Paul Strause.
S. 6480. Henry B. Burgh.	S. 7010. John L. Skinner.
S. 6490. Henry C. Tulleys.	S. 7012. William W. Nally.
S. 6500. Ephraim J. Allen.	S. 7018. Andrew Goodwin.
S. 6527. Edwin Rogers.	S. 7021. Henry Thompson.
S. 6530. George Banghart.	S. 7024. Jacob R. Stillwagon.
S. 6534. Lucy E. Sturdevant.	S. 7025. William S. Rowe.
S. 6535. Toyger Peterson.	S. 7030. Thomas L. Irwin.
S. 6536. Royal E. Dake.	S. 7033. Maurice M. Kaighn.
S. 6537. Frederick W. Mase.	S. 7034. Stephen P. Colby.
S. 6539. Ruth A. McMillan.	S. 7044. Job Wilbur.
S. 6565. Sarah Wright.	S. 7050. Minnie J. Hodge.
S. 6591. John Lamberson.	S. 7053. Martin Pool.
S. 6597. Frank T. Bolton.	S. 7059. Margaret Stevenson.
S. 6600. Frances I. Wallace.	S. 7060. Samuel C. Clossin.
S. 6607. Edward Neugent.	S. 7061. Isaac R. Atlee.
S. 6611. Jeremiah B. Davis.	S. 7062. Thomas Brown.
S. 6620. John S. Stearns.	S. 7064. John R. Simpson.
S. 6640. Henry W. Gash.	S. 7093. Theodore Longfellow.
S. 6660. Ferdinand Davis.	S. 7098. Kate M. White.
S. 6663. John Cooper.	S. 7100. Joseph C. Predmore.
S. 6694. John Hudson.	S. 7101. James S. White.
S. 6695. Henry Dalton Selby.	S. 7144. Josephine E. Ure.
S. 6700. John L. Fisher.	S. 7145. William Beauchamp.
S. 6706. Andrew M. Vanover.	S. 7153. Mettie Sanders.
S. 6713. Lewis Mensch.	S. 7158. Sidney M. Smith.
S. 6728. Samuel Holliday.	S. 7162. Joseph Chapman.
S. 6732. Horace N. Holbrook.	S. 7181. John C. Mayer.
S. 6741. John K. Mayo.	S. 7182. William F. Wahl.
S. 6742. Robert F. Hedrick.	S. 7188. John Stevens.
S. 6743. Calvin Sharpnack.	S. 7212. Timothy Welch.
S. 6756. Charles E. Collins.	S. 7213. Charles F. Smith.
S. 6759. John R. Sparrow.	S. 7214. George Maybury.
S. 6761. Reynold D. W. Campbell.	S. 7216. Moses E. Lowell.
S. 6762. James M. Treat.	S. 7218. Levi G. Foss.
S. 6763. Louisa A. Atherton.	S. 7227. Ida M. Paine.
S. 6764. Ezekial P. Rowell.	S. 7233. George F. Boothby.
S. 6766. Aura V. Thurston.	S. 7235. Thomas King.
S. 6767. Henry G. Mitchell.	S. 7237. Anna C. Stahel.
S. 6779. John W. Sperry.	S. 7250. Reason D. Evensizer.
S. 6780. Luther B. Johnson.	S. 7277. Charles F. Penley.
S. 6784. Edward F. Griswold.	S. 7284. Barber B. Durgin.
S. 6787. Henry H. Frampton.	

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. SHERWOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 20827) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman calls up House bill 20827, and asks that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of John M. Cornillon, late of Company C, Third Regiment Texas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles A. Holmes, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George M. Thompson, late of Company C, First Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Wirt V. Libby, late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William Merritt, late of Company H, Thirty-sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Herbert Green, late of Company C, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frank E. Conkling, late of Company B, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a

pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Arthur L. Perry, late of Troop F, First Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Jerome J. Miller, late of Company G, Fifty-first Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Henry S. Robert, late of Companies E and F, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Abraham H. Barnes, late of Company E, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Jasper Johnson, late of Company D, Thirtieth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Duval Johnson, late of Company M, Thirty-third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frank P. Collins, late of Company M, Second Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Ernest J. Patton, late of Company G, Second Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Eron B. Wallace, late of Company M, Second Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Josephine Burnett, widow of Richard Burnett, late of Company E, First Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William Rohder, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Carl J. Domrose, late of Company L, First Regiment Colorado Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John G. Fehrle, late of Company I, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Joseph Tanco, Jr., late of Company I, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Clifford T. Ham, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Virginia Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles A. Vanatta, late of Company M, First Regiment Colorado Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Willie E. Terry, late of Company G, Forty-fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Joseph A. M. Johnson, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Roy W. Noe, late of Company H, Signal Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Gideon B. Marshall, late of Company K, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Martha A. Knapp, dependent mother of Forrest W. Durant, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William D. Edwards, late of Company A, Twenty-third Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William B. McCarthy, late of Company D, Third Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John P. Burrow, Jr., late of United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$8 per month.

The name of Jacob Tull, late of Troop E, Ninth Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Allen P. Gabbard, late of Sixty-sixth Company United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles L. McClure, late of Company M, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Daniel F. French, late of Fifteenth Battery, United States Field Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Luke R. Ford, late of Troop L, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert B. Hawkins, late of Company G, Second Regiment United States Infantry, and Company C, Second Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Louisa Wilson, dependent mother of Michael B. Wilson, late of Troop L, Fourteenth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Willis P. McCampbell, late of Company A, General Service United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Joseph Canton, late of Company L, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles B. Reid, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Ida Bill, widow of William Bill, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William J. Givens, late of Company C, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of James F. Cummins, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Twenty-ninth Regi-

ment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. Kush, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John E. Packard, late of Company B, Eighteenth United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles M. Baughman, late of Company K, Sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Whitson, late captain of Company L, Fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George R. Weight, late a member of Company B, Fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Snyder, late of Company L, Fortieth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Edward G. Fetsch, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles Gifford, late of Company F, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Lawrence P. Williams, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Walter C. C. Jennings, late of Troop D, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frank Riska, late of Company E, Twelfth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John L. Barber, late of Company D, Second Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Arthur B. Clark, late of Company K, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Benjamin Harrison, late of Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph P. Riley, helpless and dependent child of Joseph V. Riley, late of Troop A, Fifth United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William J. Riley, helpless and dependent child of Joseph V. Riley, late of Troop A, Fifth United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Patrick McDonald, late of Company A, Twenty-eighth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Howard M. Greenwald, late of Company L, Eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Hood Sikes, late of Company B, First Territorial United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Edward Evans, late of Company E, Thirtieth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harry W. Feldman, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William A. Ritter, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Herbert W. Barnhart, late of Company D, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Louis F. Orsenbach, late of band, First Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank A. Smith, of detachment of Engineers, United States Military Academy, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William M. Davis, late of Battery B, Georgia Light Artillery, and Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John Johnson, late of Company G, Second Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Orin Marshall, late of Company A, First Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John F. Chamberlain, late of Company B, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Harry L. Peebles, late unassigned recruit Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Robert T. Rowland, late of Companies B and D, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$8 per month.

The name of Thomas Horan, late of United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Herbert S. Cooley, late of Troop A, First United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Lewis L. Cummings, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marie G. Harding, widow of Arthur E. Harding, late captain, Marine Corps, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Arthur Patten, late of Company B, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Robert L. Crook, jr., late major, Third Regiment Mississippi Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James F. Conkley, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Louis S. Harris, late of Battery A, Third Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Richard Thrash, late of Troop A, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles L. Thompson, late of Company G, (Burnett's) New York Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Franklin Williams, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret A. Wells, widow of Martin C. Wells, late of Capt. Morgan's company of Iowa Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Alfred J. Yarber, late of Company M, Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frank M. Clark, late of Company M, Sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas M. Rodgers, late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Martin L. Thomas, late of Company I, Forty-fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Augustus Light, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Justus W. Swanberg, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Fred Angelo, late of Troop C, Thirteenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Arthur Plank, late of Troop K, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James W. Lathrop, late of United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lily D. Murphy, widow of Frank T. Murphy, late of Battery K, Third Regiment United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles V. Grogan, late of the United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Robert J. Clement, dependent father of Ira C. Clement, late of Company G, First Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ida M. Zimmerman, widow of Charles A. Zimmerman, late leader of the Naval Academy Band, Regular Establishment, with the rank of Lieutenant, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James L. McDougall, late of Company K, Thirty-first Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Michael J. Rowland, late of Company H, First Regiment Wyoming Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James E. Braddock, late of Company F, Twenty-eighth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Henry B. Gaylor, late of One hundred and sixty-ninth Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph R. Hunter, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Ingabow Falls, widow of John M. Falls, late of Company K, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George W. Paul, late of Company D, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Frank L. Schearman, alias Frank L. Sherman, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of George Parliament, late of Company C, Second Regiment Louisiana Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, Thirty-ninth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George Wisneaukas, late of the Forty-second Company, United States Coast Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Clara D. Peterson, widow of Henry Peterson, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the two minor children of the said Henry Peterson until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Martha E. Wardlaw, widow of John B. Wardlaw, late of Capt. Tally's company, First Georgia Drafted Militia, Indian War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Caroline Philpot, widow of Allen Philpot, alias William Philpot, late of Capt. John Witcher's company, Georgia Mounted Volunteers, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Otto H. Staron, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Polly Tipton, widow of Gutch T. Tipton, late of Company H, Thirty-sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and

\$2 per month additional on account of each of the four minor children of the said Gutch T. Tipton until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Murray H. Lewis, late of Company C, First Regiment Colorado Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of David S. Harrison, late of United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Louis M. Rheame, late of Company E, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Rebecca Morris, widow of James E. Morris, late of Capt. W. H. Kendrick's company, Florida Mounted Volunteers, Indian War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma F. Buchanan, widow of Francis A. Buchanan, late of Capt. Childs's company, South Carolina Mounted Volunteers, Indian War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Annie N. Sullivan, widow of Calvin Sullivan, late of Capt. Yoakum's Tennessee Volunteers, Indian War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret R. Brevard, widow of Zebulon Brevard, late of Capt. McLin's company, Tennessee Volunteers, Indian War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

This bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

H. R. 1107. John M. Cornelson.	H. R. 14591. Hood Sikes.
H. R. 1304. Charles A. Holmes.	H. R. 14681. Edward Evans.
H. R. 1640. George M. Thompson.	H. R. 14780. Harry W. Feldman.
H. R. 2091. Wirt V. Libby.	H. R. 14764. William A. Ritter.
H. R. 2360. William Merritt.	H. R. 15355. Herbert W. Barnhart.
H. R. 2586. Herbert Green.	H. R. 15422. Louis F. Urseback.
H. R. 2631. Frank E. Conkling.	H. R. 15669. Frank A. Smith.
H. R. 2754. Arthur L. Perry.	H. R. 15773. William M. Davis.
H. R. 2982. Jerome J. Miller.	H. R. 15854. John Johnson.
H. R. 3831. Heby S. Robert.	H. R. 16001. Orin Marshall.
H. R. 4022. Abraham H. Barnes.	H. R. 16370. John F. Chamberlain.
H. R. 4641. Jasper Johnson.	H. R. 16378. Harry L. Peebles.
H. R. 5067. Duval Johnson.	H. R. 16636. Robert T. Rowland.
H. R. 5325. Frank P. Collins.	H. R. 16698. Thomas Horan.
H. R. 6002. Ernest J. Patton.	H. R. 17093. Herbert S. Cooley.
H. R. 6149. Eron B. Wallace.	H. R. 17108. Lewis L. Cummings.
H. R. 6411. Josephine Burnett.	H. R. 17209. Marie G. Harding.
H. R. 7044. William Rohder.	H. R. 17358. Robert Patten.
H. R. 7414. Carl J. Domrose.	H. R. 17359. Robert L. Crook.
H. R. 7519. John G. Fehrlie.	H. R. 17559. James E. Coakley.
H. R. 7717. Joseph Tanco.	H. R. 17673. Louis F. Harris.
H. R. 7814. Clifford T. Ham.	H. R. 17929. Richard Thrash.
H. R. 7875. Charles A. Vanatta.	H. R. 18066. Charles L. Thompson.
H. R. 7892. Willie E. Terry.	H. R. 18264. Franklin Williams.
H. R. 8055. Joseph A. M. Johnson.	H. R. 18276. Margaret A. Wells.
H. R. 8799. Roy W. Noe.	H. R. 18344. Alfred J. Yarber.
H. R. 8833. Gideon B. Marshall.	H. R. 18423. Frank M. Clark.
H. R. 9185. Martha A. Knapp.	H. R. 18467. Thomas M. Rodgers.
H. R. 9496. William D. Edwards.	H. R. 18525. Martin L. Thomas.
H. R. 9497. William B. McCarthy.	H. R. 18628. Augustus Light.
H. R. 9753. John F. Burrow, jr.	H. R. 18645. Justus W. Swanberg.
H. R. 10472. Jacob Tull.	H. R. 18662. Fred Angelo.
H. R. 10449. Allen P. Gabbard.	H. R. 18857. Arthur Plank.
H. R. 10634. Charles L. McClure.	H. R. 18870. James W. Lathrop.
H. R. 10714. Daniel F. French.	H. R. 19017. Lily D. Murphy.
H. R. 10793. Luke R. Ford.	H. R. 19035. Charles V. Grogan.
H. R. 10825. Robert R. Hawkins.	H. R. 19133. Robert J. Clement.
H. R. 10862. Louisa Wilson.	H. R. 19157. Ida M. Zimmerman.
H. R. 11013. Willis P. McCampbell.	H. R. 19250. James L. McDougall.
H. R. 11508. Joseph Canton.	H. R. 19370. Michael J. Rowland.
H. R. 11573. Charles B. Reid.	H. R. 19673. James E. Braddock.
H. R. 11655. Ida Bill.	H. R. 19818. Henry B. Gaylor.
H. R. 12097. William J. Givens.	H. R. 20127. Joseph R. Hunter.
H. R. 12141. James F. Cummins.	H. R. 20227. Ingabow Falls.
H. R. 12393. William A. Kush.	H. R. 20247. George W. Paul.
H. R. 12622. John E. Packard.	H. R. 20260. Frank L. Schearman,
H. R. 12698. Charles M. Baughman.	alias Frank L. Sher-
H. R. 12861. Thomas Whitson.	man.
H. R. 12896. George R. Weight.	H. R. 20299. George Parliament.
H. R. 12957. John Snyder.	H. R. 20305. George Wisneaukas.
H. R. 13157. Edward G. Fetsch.	H. R. 20343. Clara D. Peterson.
H. R. 13172. Charles Gilford.	H. R. 20372. Martha E. Wardlaw.
H. R. 13202. Lawrence P. Williams.	H. R. 20389. Caroline Philpot.
H. R. 13209. Walter C. C. Jennings.	H. R. 20392. Otto H. Staron.
H. R. 13235. Frank Riska.	H. R. 20491. Polly Tipton.
H. R. 13256. John L. Barber.	H. R. 20586. Murray H. Lewis.
H. R. 13302. Arthur B. Clark.	H. R. 20623. David S. Harrison.
H. R. 14141. Benjamin Harrison.	H. R. 20701. Louis M. Rheame.
H. R. 14284. Joseph P. Riley.	H. R. 20715. Rebecca Morris.
H. R. 14285. William J. Riley.	H. R. 20731. Emma F. Buchanan.
H. R. 14311. Patrick McDonald.	H. R. 20740. Annie N. Sullivan.
H. R. 14513. Howard M. Green-	H. R. 20741. Margaret R. Brevard.
wald.	

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. Key of Ohio, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

NAVY YARDS AND NAVAL STATIONS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, Report No. 3 of the Commission on Navy Yards and Naval Stations, dated January 31, 1917.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 9, 1917.

OUR RIGHTS ON THE SEAS.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks in the Record by printing documents relating to our rights upon the seas.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of his remarks documents concerning our rights upon the seas. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Ohio what is the nature of these documents, and what is the extent of them.

Mr. FESS. Yesterday I placed in the RECORD the documents pertaining to our controversy with Germany on the submarine question. Now I should like to print the documents relating to our controversy with Great Britain on the question of contraband, blockades, and so forth, separate from the German controversy.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; but what I inquired or tried to inquire was—

Mr. FESS. How extensive the documents are?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes. First, how extensive, and, secondly, do these documents come from the State Department?

Mr. FESS. I got a good many from the State Department, but there are some which I get from the New York Times.

Mr. BARNHART. Does the gentleman think newspaper reports are sufficiently reliable? Might they not be colored so as to be misleading?

Mr. FESS. My intention is to print nothing except official documents. I do not print opinions or newspaper comments, but simply the documents themselves.

Mr. TOWNER. Let me say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] that these documents are exceedingly valuable to Members of Congress, and it is desirable to have them in a form in which they may be available, and not in scattered newspaper articles, which, as the gentleman says, are very often unreliable. But I take it the gentleman is perhaps aware that the New York Times is publishing these documents, and publishing also a current history of the war which is supposed to be as nearly official and as reliable as anything that can be procured. I am sure Dr. Fess will not put in anything that is not desirable and reliable.

Mr. FESS. I will not print any opinions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DIGEST OF CONTESTED-ELECTION CASES (H. REPT. 1445).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I rise to submit a privileged resolution, which I ask to have read and considered at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana submits a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 70.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there be printed 5,000 copies, bound in buckram, for the use of the House of Representatives, of the manuscript prepared by Hon. MERRILL MOORES, being a digest of contested-election cases in the House of Representatives from 1901 to 1917, together with laws relating to contested elections in the House of Representatives and campaign contributions and expenditures.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. How are these copies to be distributed?

Mr. BARNHART. Through the folding room.

Mr. STAFFORD. The resolution does not make any such provision.

Mr. BARNHART. They go to the folding room unless the resolution provides otherwise.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thought perhaps the Committees on Elections might desire some copies of this document.

Mr. BARNHART. There are 5,000 copies. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is the author of the resolution, and I heartily concur in it. At this time, when so many election cases are coming up, I think it is important that this digest be brought down to date.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not wish it to be understood that I am opposing the resolution. I am only inquiring as to the method of distribution.

Mr. MANN. That will be through the folding room.

Mr. BARNHART. If there is no other provision in a resolution of this sort, the documents go to the folding room.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is there any necessity for binding all these copies in buckram? I should think you could have a given

number bound in buckram for the individual Members, and the rest could be bound in paper.

Mr. BARNHART. The difference in cost between buckram and paper is less than \$500. If we should have a part of them bound in buckram and the rest in paper, the difference in cost would be so slight that it was the opinion of the committee that we had better bind them all in buckram, the volume being an important one.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

FOX RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the Fox River Bridge bill, which was passed by the House yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the Fox River Bridge bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MOORE'S DIGEST OF INTERNATIONAL LAW (H. REPT. 1447).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution which I ask to have considered at the present time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana sends up a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 31.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That 1,000 copies of Moore's Digest of International Law of the House of Representatives be printed, 700 for use of the folding room of the House and 300 for use of the folding room of the Senate, and the superintendents of the said folding rooms are hereby authorized to deliver not more than one copy to each Member of the Senate and each Member of the House on request of the Member desiring same.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Certainly.

Mr. LANGLEY. What will be done with the balance of the volumes? There will be only one, you say, for each Member, and there are but 435 Members.

Mr. BARNHART. They will be held in the folding room until our successors come in and take them up, one by one.

Mr. LANGLEY. I wish the gentleman would make it enough so as to give each Member two sets.

Mr. BARNHART. The difficulty is in the expense, and the extra set would hardly be worth while. Unless we had enough to distribute to those who are asking for them, we would be in a worse situation than if we could say we did not have any for free distribution.

Mr. LANGLEY. The reason that I make the suggestion is that I have in mind one very urgent request from my district for a copy, and I need one myself.

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman, being familiar with international law, can give his copy to him.

Mr. LANGLEY. Well, as a matter of fact, I did take a three years' course in international law in the George Washington University, and I have a diploma for that course, with the names of several distinguished authorities signed to it, including such men as the late Justices Harlan and Brewer, of the Supreme Court, and David Jayne Hill. [Applause.] Apparently the gentleman from Indiana did not know that.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I think there is no authority under existing law for documents to be held in the folding room and delivered to Members who come into the House hereafter. Has the committee jurisdiction over that matter? The law requires equal distribution between the districts, and the extra numbers go to the superintendent of documents for sale.

Mr. BARNHART. Does the gentleman think that the balance would go to the superintendent of documents after the enactment of this resolution?

Mr. MANN. I do not know; probably the gentleman knows more about it than I do; but under the present law, where documents go to the folding room, there is an equal distribution between the districts, and the extra numbers go to the superintendent of documents for sale.

Mr. BARNHART. That is where there are a few extra numbers left over after an equal apportionment to Members.

Mr. MANN. If there is a vacancy in my district and that vacancy is filled, there is no law that gives preference to that district in the distribution of documents in preference to another district represented by a Member who remains here.

Mr. BARNHART. The committee had that situation under consideration, and we have specifically enacted that these shall be sent to the folding room and not more than one set be given

to each Member, and the folding room thereby will hold the balance until they are taken up.

Mr. MANN. The folding room will have to hold them; but can they ever do anything with them?

Mr. BARNHART. They can give them out in accordance with this resolution.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Has the printing of the Moores's International Digest been heretofore authorized?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Then this involves a duplication or an extension.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are the plates in existence?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why does the committee provide a larger surplus for the Senate than for the House? The Senate does not change as often as the House.

Mr. BARNHART. The experience of the committee has been that unless we give to the Senators a proportion of one-third, which they claim as their share, they do not play ball; they let the resolution die, and we need these books.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then it is in consonance with the rule rather than the harmony of the two bodies.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes. I do not want to make any statement about the other body that will have to be stricken from the Record, as sometimes happens.

The resolution was agreed to.

JOURNAL OF THE GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC (H. REPT. 1446).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 65.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed as a House document 1,500 copies of the Journal of the fifty-first national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, for the year 1917, not to exceed \$1,700 in cost, with illustrations, 1,000 copies of which shall be for the use of the House and 500 for the use of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was considered and agreed to.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20632, the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. PAGE of North Carolina in the chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter all laws relating to the examination of officers of the Navy for promotion shall be construed to apply to the regular advancement of staff officers to higher ranks on the active list, the same as though such advancements in rank were promotions to higher grades: *Provided*, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as in any way affecting the original appointment of officers to the Dental Corps as provided in the act approved August 29, 1916, making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I would like to ask what is the meaning of this?

Mr. PADGETT. In the last naval appropriation bill, in the legislation reorganizing the personnel of the Navy, there was inserted a provision known as the running-mate provision for the Staff Corps—where a man on the Staff Corps would go up with his running mate in the line, the man next after whom he holds his commission. It appears that there is another statute passed some years ago requiring all the officers promoted from one grade to a higher grade to pass an examination—mental, physical, moral, and professional—in order to go up to the higher grade. With reference to the running-mate provision he might go up in rank and receive pay, but be held down in the original grade without passing the examination. This simply provides that he shall pass the examination which is now provided by law in the grade before he goes up in the rank and receives the advance pay.

Mr. MANN. Let me see if I understand the gentleman. An officer of the line is promoted, and that would give automatic promotion to his running mate on the staff, and under existing law the officer on the staff is not required to take an examination, but he gets increased pay?

Mr. PADGETT. He would go up under the running-mate provision without examination in rank, but would not in grade.

Mr. MANN. I say under existing law he would get increase in pay without taking an examination.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. This is to require him to take the examination before he gets an increase in rank or pay.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The other day the gentleman had an amendment read for information enabling the President to commandeer the various activities of the Government. I believe that the chairman stated that he was going to call the committee together to consider that provision, as well as—

Mr. PADGETT. Two others.

Mr. STAFFORD. As well as the Government purchasing the rights to patents in aviation.

Mr. PADGETT. And also expediting appropriations.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to inquire whether the committee has made any formal report upon the respective measures, and whether they are in print, so that the Members of the House can have them before they are submitted?

Mr. PADGETT. No. I have a draft of it here, and I can tell the gentleman what it is. If the gentleman will take the bill H. R. 20779 I can explain it. All of paragraph (d) is eliminated. That is the paragraph that authorizes the commandeering of labor. Then, on page 4, line 2, the language "at such reasonable price as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Navy" is changed by inserting the word "President" instead of the words "Secretary of the Navy," so that it would be determined by the President. The other changes are simply verbal and do not change the meaning in substance.

Mr. STAFFORD. May I inquire what is the purpose of the chairman as to the two other proposals?

Mr. PADGETT. There was no change made except that with reference to aviation there was an additional proviso added, as follows:

Provided further, That in the event there shall be pending in court litigation involving the validity of said patent or patents bond with good and approved securities in an amount sufficient to indemnify the United States shall be required, payable to the United States, conditioned to repay to the United States the amount paid for said patent or patents in the event said patent or patents are finally adjudged invalid.

That was added for the reason that there is now pending litigation in the courts. The Curtiss Co., that manufactures aeroplanes, proceeded, so it is contended by the Wright Co., to infringe upon the Wright Co. patents.

Mr. STAFFORD. I did not wish to enter into a discussion of the merits of the respective propositions.

Mr. PADGETT. I was just giving the reasons.

Mr. STAFFORD. I merely want to have for the benefit of the House the action of the committee, so that the House can consider the respective proposals before they are offered formally for consideration.

Mr. PADGETT. Because of that pending litigation we inserted this proviso requiring a bond to indemnify in case that finally the patent should be adjudged an invalid patent. In other words, we do not want to buy a patent that is not any good.

Mr. STAFFORD. As to the third proposal, House bill 20781, providing for the expeditious delivery, has there been any change in that?

Mr. PADGETT. The committee inserted the words "in his discretion," so that it would read:

That to enable the President in his discretion, etc.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am much obliged to the gentleman for his information.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This section relates to the personnel of the Navy, and the personnel is more important than the matériel.

Mr. PADGETT. I think they go together.

Mr. FOSS. I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he thinks they have made ample provision here for the personnel of the Navy? That is to say, for the increase in officers and the increase in the number of men.

Mr. PADGETT. I think so. That is all provided for in the act of August 29, so far as the officers are concerned. We base it for the first time on a percentage of the enlisted strength, and that authorized a total commissioned strength in the line of 2,988, as I remember, and at that time we had 2,130, and odd. We also provided for additional appointments to Annapolis, which made the increase of 531, running the total appointments up to about 1,800 from about 1,300.

Mr. FOSS. I want to state to the gentleman that I was particularly struck by the testimony of Admiral Palmer, to be found on page 599, in which he stated that if we should mobilize to-day we would be about 938 officers short; that is, by put-

ting all of the ships into commission, which we have never yet been able to do.

Mr. PADGETT. In explanation of that, I can state that we have about 700 officers available from the Naval Militia, and then we have all of the retired officers, and that would more than fill it up, so that the whole 938 could be made up from the Naval Militia and retired officers and still leave a surplus.

Mr. FOSS. I would like to ask the gentleman in reference to the enlisted force. We provide in this bill for 68,000. Is that correct?

Mr. PADGETT. The authorized strength of the Navy, I think, is 78,000 and something, and the appropriation is made in this bill to take care of an increase up to 70,000 during the fiscal year.

Mr. FOSS. I want to call the gentleman's attention to what Admiral Palmer said on the same page, 599. He said, in speaking of mobilization, if that should occur—and, of course, that is the first thing that will occur if we should get into trouble with any foreign power, which I trust we will not do—we would be short about 8,049 Regulars and 23,330 reserves, after using 9,000 militia and 463 fleet reserves, and that the shortage would increase for each new ship commissioned in 1917 and 1918, and the three-year program alone would require 29,127 men. Then, over on page 601, there is a preliminary estimate of the personnel required for mobilization plan for July, 1916, which calls for enlisted men, Regulars, to the number of 99,809, and reserves, 45,870. How near do we approach at the present time, or under the provisions of this bill, to these requirements stated by Admiral Palmer, Chief of the Bureau of Navigation?

Mr. PADGETT. The President is authorized in time of emergency to increase to, I believe, 88,000 in the bill of last year, and then we have between nine and ten thousand in the Naval Militia.

Then we have the reserve that was provided and created by the act of August 29—845—a few days ago. Then the others would have to be enlistments which would come in from the 30,000 or 35,000 of ex-enlisted men who were out in civil life, who have gone out of the service and—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I renew my motion to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes additional. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PADGETT. And, as the gentleman is aware, there is a large number of ex-enlisted men in civil life; and Admiral Blue stated to the committee, I think last year it was, that the department had a mailing list of addresses in which they could be in touch with a large number of those men.

Mr. FOSS. Will all of these men which the gentlemen has spoken of, some—

Mr. PADGETT. If the gentleman will permit me for just a moment. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] asked me if the ex-enlisted men can be forced back in time of war, and I said to him, no; but that needs some qualification. Prior to two years ago all those who went out of the service prior to that time could not, but in the act of two years ago we had inserted a provision so that ex-enlisted men can be called back into the service.

Mr. HAMLIN. I thought so.

Mr. PADGETT. Where they retire, where they are on the retired list, they can be called back.

Mr. HAMLIN. I thought there was such a provision in a recent bill.

Mr. PADGETT. That is true in reference to the retired list. Now, that does not apply to where a man enlists and serves out his service and goes completely out of the service and severs all connection with the service.

Mr. FOSS. I would like to ask the gentleman, summing up all these different bodies of men to which the gentleman has referred, what would that make as our total of enlisted force if they should come in?

Mr. PADGETT. With ex-enlisted men?

Mr. FOSS. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. One hundred and twenty-five thousand; something like that, or possibly 130,000. I do not know the exact number.

Mr. FOSS. That would leave, then, a shortage of about 25,000 in case of a mobilization of our naval forces, according to this statement?

Mr. PADGETT. Taking that statement for the full completion of the three-year program of all ships under construction and those which are authorized for the third year of this three-year program, but you see their third-year program would take several years to be completed.

Mr. FOSS. We are speeding up on the program, and it is necessary to train men in advance. They ought to have at least a full year's training before going on these big ships, and if they had two years it would be all the better.

Mr. PADGETT. It would be impossible to complete these big ships that take 1,200 and 1,300 men much short of 30 months under any circumstances.

Mr. FOSS. Then the gentleman feels we have made ample provision in this bill for the personnel in view of the circumstances?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think we need to make more at this time; if an emergency arises, we could authorize.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Considerable has been said—

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment? I desire to ask unanimous consent that all debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes, to ask some questions.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I would want five minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. Well, I will say 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate upon the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, considerable has been said in the last two or three days with a view of comparison between what transpired under the Taft administration and what occurred under the present administration in the way of shipbuilding as well as to personnel, and it has been repeatedly stated on the floor of the House that the enlisted personnel under the Taft administration was 51,500, and that the enlisted personnel under the present administration is 77,956—

Mr. PADGETT. That was authorized; neither one of them were up to their full limit.

Mr. BRITTEN. That is just the very point I am coming to, Mr. Chairman. Attempt has been made continually to convey the impression that the Navy to-day was 26,000 better supplied with ordinary seamen than under the Taft administration, referring always to the authorization, when the truth of the matter is—

Mr. PADGETT. But let me say to the gentleman I have stated time and again to the contrary of that, and I think the House understands that that refers to authorizations—

Mr. BRITTEN. If the gentleman will permit me—

Mr. PADGETT. And not to the actual enlistments.

Mr. BRITTEN. I am just elucidating, not asking the gentleman a question at this particular moment. I am simply using five minutes of time in making a statement.

Mr. PADGETT. Then, I will not take up the gentleman's time; I thought he was addressing a question to me.

Mr. BRITTEN. No, sir. I want to call attention to the fact that under the Taft administration the enlisted personnel of the Navy was recruited up to 92 per cent of the authorization, and I also want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the enlisted personnel of the Navy to-day, after three years of world unrest, is recruited only 68 per cent of its authorization.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BRITTEN. I can not yield inasmuch as I have only a few minutes.

Notwithstanding the fact, as I said before I was interrupted by my good friend from Texas, that the world has been at unrest for more than three years, and the need for men in the service has been evident everywhere but in the Navy Department, on February 1 we are recruited only 68 per cent of the authorization of 77,956, exclusive of 2,313 men with the Militia or on probation. And I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the Navy is worse off to-day by 3,024 than it was four years ago in the matter of enlisted personnel. In the last four years we have commissioned the *Arizona*, the *Nevada*, the *New York*, the *Oklahoma*, the *Pennsylvania*, and the *Texas*, all dreadnaughts, taking practically a thousand men apiece, or a total of 5,640 ordinary seamen. We have commissioned 24 destroyers, and we have two more, the *Shaw* and the *Allen*, over 95 per cent completed, which will require 2,600 men. We have commissioned 20 submarines, requiring 630 men, and 3 little gunboats requiring 237 men. The total requirement of the enlisted personnel of the ships commissioned during the Wilson administration is 9,107. With a positive increase of but 6,083 men in the last four years, it will be seen that the actual additional requirement on account of new ships makes us just 3,024 enlisted men worse off than when the present administration came into power.

Now, the idea of talking about the Taft administration and referring to the authorization to-day in comparison with what it was four years ago is all poppycock. You can not get away from a deficiency to-day of 24,500 men in the ordinary seamen of the service. So the Navy is worse off to-day in the point of shortage than it was four years ago. And I want to say further that this accentuates, if it is possible for anything to accentuate it, the lack of business administration in the Navy Department under the present administration. [Applause.]

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. He said in answer to an inquiry by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss], as I understood him, that there was no expectation of filling the necessary complement for vessels already in commission until, as he expressed it, some necessity arose. Is that true?

Mr. PADGETT. I did not say that.

Mr. TOWNER. I hope I misunderstood the chairman—

Mr. PADGETT. You did if that was your understanding. I said that the three-year program would require for the construction of the big ships, the battle cruisers and the battleships, at least 30 months for construction, even if expedited. The time that the contractors offered was, first, 48 months and 51 months, and the lowest they have up to the present time indicated was 40 months. But assuming that they should speed up to 30 months, I said for those ships provision could be made as they came into commission.

Mr. TOWNER. Let me ask the gentleman this question: As I understand it, the department says they are doing all that they can to fill the deficiencies in the personnel of the Navy under existing law?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. And yet notwithstanding that fact there is existing a large deficiency now. Will the gentleman tell us what efforts are being made, and especially what provisions are made in this bill or any other, to fill the personnel of the Navy, at least to the extent of manning the ships that are now in commission?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir. The Navy Department is using every effort and energy. They are advertising, they are establishing recruiting stations throughout the country, and they have been publishing and circulating, so as to get in touch with the public, the provisions of the law of August 29, 1916, reorganizing the personnel of the Navy, the enlisted personnel, whereby we gave very substantial advantages and benefits to the enlisted men. And as that is getting out and they are becoming acquainted with it, the enlistments are proceeding with much more satisfaction than heretofore. For instance, I had the statement here, which I read on a former day, but I now call attention to it merely, that in January, 1914, the net gain in enlistments was 793 for the month. They do not go back of that time. They have no record kept before that time. That was in January, 1914. In January, 1915, the net gain was 375; in January, 1916, the gain was 576; in January, 1917, just past, under the operation of this new legislation that I stated, which information has just been scattered abroad and made known to the public, the net gain was 1,344.

Mr. TOWNER. Well, but does the gentleman believe that within a reasonable time we can fill the complement of the ships in commission?

Mr. PADGETT. The chief of the bureau, Admiral Palmer, informed me that he expected, and he based his expectations upon an investigation into the working of the plan, and believed that during the fiscal year for which this legislation is passed he would have the enlistments up to 70,000.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that the country will not be satisfied with that. I believe that at present, and under existing circumstances, the people will demand that the ships that we have in commission be fully manned. They will demand that our Navy be ready for any emergency. They will demand that anything that is necessary to be done to secure a full complement for the ships now in commission should be done. And it occurs to me that it is the duty of this committee, and it is the duty of the administration, to take immediate steps to see that this be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] has expired.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words for the purpose of referring to what occurred yesterday when several distinguished gentlemen, members of the Committee on Military Affairs, found it necessary to defend themselves against an attack contained in a newspaper published in the city of Chicago. What I deplore is not the attack contained in the paper. I do not care who the editor of the paper is. I do not know whether he writes his own opinions, or whether he is just an ordinary hireling, taking orders. I do not know

whether he believed in what he said or whether he said it because he was ordered to say it. What I regret is that the Members of the House find it necessary to defend themselves against meaningless attacks of this kind. I look upon the news items and the editorial complained of as an attempt to intimidate Members of the House from giving expression to their honest opinion and from acting in accordance with their honest conviction. Only a few days ago we heard abuse heaped from the floor of this House upon one of the most distinguished statesmen that the country has produced, William Jennings Bryan [applause], and all because he dared advise against war. The Constitution has given Congress the power to declare war. Does it mean that Congress is merely to act as a rubber-stamp clerk, obeying the orders of an individual, or does it mean that every Member of Congress is conscience bound as a man and as a Representative of a free people to search his own soul and to utilize all the power of his brain in determining the gravest question that can present itself in the life of a man? And shall Members of Congress permit themselves to be frightened, to be intimidated by bullies, by lip patriots, by ignoramuses, who would terrorize those they can not control? I protest, Mr. Chairman, against this attempt to intimidate the free Representatives of a free people from acting as free men. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provisions, Navy: For provisions and commuted rations for the seamen and marines, which commuted rations may be paid to caterers of messes, in case of death or desertion, upon orders of the commanding officers, commuted rations for officers on sea duty (other than commissioned officers of the line, Medical and Pay Corps, chaplains, chief boatswains, chief gunners, chief carpenters, chief machinists, chief pay clerks, and chief sailmakers) and midshipmen, and commuted rations stopped on account of sick in hospital and credited at the rate of 50 cents per ration to the naval hospital fund; subsistence of officers and men unavoidably detained or absent from vessels to which attached under orders (during which subsistence rations to be stopped on board ship and no credit for commutation therefor to be given); subsistence of men on detached duty; subsistence of members of the Naval Reserve force during period of active service; and for subsistence of female nurses and Navy and Marine Corps general courts-martial prisoners undergoing imprisonment with sentences of dishonorable discharge from the service at the expiration of such confinement: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to commute rations for such general courts-martial prisoners in such amounts as seem to him proper, which may vary in accordance with the location of the naval prison, but which shall in no case exceed 30 cents per diem for each ration so commuted; and for the purchase of United States Army emergency rations as required; in all, \$10,144,943.40, to be available until the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, in no spirit of criticism of the Committee on Naval Affairs, or of any of the Members of this House, I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that last year we passed a naval bill and this year we will pass a naval bill, and yet apparently no attention has been given to the number of retired officers that this Government is now supporting.

I have no disposition to criticize these officers, because under the law, as provided by Congress and as I understand it, they have to be retired whenever the plucking board desires to retire them, or when they reach the age of 64, and therefore they are not to blame; but I thought it might be interesting to the country to know that there are to-day 900 retired naval officers, men the majority of whom I am satisfied are in perfect physical and mental condition, and who would object to being called "old men" or "broken-down horses," who are receiving from the taxpayers of the country three-quarters of their salary and for which they give nothing in return. In the present bill there is provided for the purpose of paying these gentlemen the sum of \$2,940,368.72.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the present war across the waters has demonstrated that gray-haired men and men beyond the age of 64, as leaders, are waging the successful battles, and that the United States might well learn something from that demonstration and retain in the service longer than the age of 64 is reached, these men who are so anxious to remain in the service.

The present bill provides for the promotion and retirement of naval officers, and this will continue until the people begin to understand that in the Army and Navy bills we have passed and to-day will pass paying approximately \$7,000,000 for retired Army and Navy officers.

I say, Mr. Chairman, if some reasonable law should be passed, and one that would not impose a hardship upon these, that would let these patriotic officers, whom we have educated at great expense, continue to serve the Government, and thereby save this Government the larger part of this \$7,000,000, we

could use it in increased pay for the ordinary seamen who serve on the battleships, and then, perhaps, the shortage of men that the gentleman from Illinois just complained of would not exist.

I simply make these observations—

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. What percentage of these retired officers of the Army and Navy are under 64 years—that is, victims of the plucking board?

Mr. SEARS. I have tried to secure the information, but I am unable to tell the gentleman. I understand that some as young as 45 or 50 years of age were plucked because the plucking board said they were temperamentally not fit to continue longer in the service.

Now, Mr. Chairman, at the Naval Academy, which is one of the best academies in the country—and I desire at a later time to discuss that proposition—these distinguished, able, patriotic men could be used for the purpose of teaching the young men that we send there for instruction from our various districts. By so doing, Mr. Chairman, they would not only give to these young men the benefit of their knowledge, but also their varied experience. It seems to me that a man who holds a degree from the Annapolis Naval Academy and has had 20 years or more actual experience in the service, as these young men that we are sending there are expected to have, could better instruct these young men than could civilians who know nothing of the service and are simply selected because they are able to undergo a mental examination.

I think, Mr. Chairman, the time is coming when the people of the United States will demand that they be informed as to how and why their money is spent, and that this \$7,000,000—a paltry sum to some, it may be—will cease to be appropriated by Congress to support people on the retired list who are anxious to serve the Government actively and who now return no service for value received. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I fully agree with the opinion of the gentleman [Mr. SEARS] who has just taken his seat on this matter of retired officers of the Navy. I know of instances, as do other Members of this House, of men who have been retired from the naval service and who have been granted the regular retired pay, but who are just as active to-day as they ever were, except for the few years that have been added to their lives.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are in the service to-day men who are on the retired list who are acting in the capacity of captains and are receiving only retired officers' pay; in other words, they are receiving lieutenant commander's pay. As I understand it, there is nothing in the law that permits the Secretary of the Navy to draft an officer back into the service and give him the same rate of pay that he received before he was retired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Do I understand the gentleman to say there is no authority for the department to call men from the retired list and put them on the active list?

Mr. TAGUE. Oh, no, Mr. Chairman; the Secretary of the Navy or the President, I believe, can call in any retired officer. But, as I understand it, if a retired officer is called into the service he can be paid only the amount of wage that he received as a retired officer, no matter what he was getting before.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman is mistaken in that. If he is called to active duty, he gets his full pay and allowances. There is another provision to the effect that if a retired officer requests shore duty he can, at his request, be assigned to some shore duty and get the pay and allowances of a lieutenant commander. But if he is called to active duty he gets his full pay and allowances of his grade; and in time of war every retired officer is subject to be called to active duty.

Mr. BUTLER. In case of an emergency?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. I want to state another thing in that connection. Last year Congress increased the retiring age from 62 to 64 years; and the retiring age is greater in the Army and in the Navy of the United States—and I am speaking especially of the Navy—than it is in the navy of England or France.

Now, with reference to the pay. Up until the bill of August 29, 1916, they received three-fourths of the active pay which they were receiving at the time of retirement. Now that has been changed, and for a service of 30 years they get 2½ per cent for each year, which would be three-quarters pay, but for every year of service less than that the amount is reduced 2½ per cent, so that a man has to serve 30 years in order to get three-quarters pay. That was the law of August 29, 1916, and it is no longer based upon the full three-fourths retired pay.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask an extension of my time for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts, having now one minute remaining, asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEARS. On page 49 there is appropriated, in addition to the amount I gave, \$198,307.50 for the increased pay of retired officers regularly assigned to active duty. I do not know whether that is in addition to their retired pay, or extra pay, or what it is, but it adds \$198,000 to the amount.

Mr. PADGETT. Let me correct the statement of the gentleman. The \$198,000 is for the entire pay of all the retired officers of the Marine Corps.

Mr. TAGUE. While the chairman of the committee is of course better informed on this subject than most of us, still my contention is this: If a retired officer is active enough to perform service for the Government, and does so at his own request, then he is entitled to the remuneration that he received while in active service. Now, for instance, we have in the navy yard at Boston a commandant who, until last October, was rated as a captain. He went before the plucking board for advancement to rear admiral—

Mr. PADGETT. Not the plucking board.

Mr. TAGUE. Whatever you want to call it.

Mr. PADGETT. It is the examining board.

Mr. TAGUE. The examining board. He was examined and found to be physically and mentally sound, but for some slight and trivial matter he was not allowed his promotion, but was retired with a lieutenant commander's pay. Now, that man is to-day doing the same service for the Government that he has done in that yard for three years. He is commandant of the yard, and he is receiving in return the pay of a lieutenant commander. I do not know just how much, but much less than he received as a captain. He is performing good service for the Government. He is physically and mentally able to perform that service. He has a record in the Navy as good as that of any man who ever served in it, and was honored by receiving a medal for bravery from Congress. Yet for a trifling matter this man is compelled to be retired against his own wish and against the wish of those who know him. He is working to-day for the Government. He is performing the full duty of a commandant and captain and is receiving a lieutenant commander's pay. There is no provision in the law, and there is no provision in this bill, that permits the Secretary of the Navy or the President of the United States to give this man one single cent more than the pay of a lieutenant commander. I think this is unfair. I do not believe the law was ever intended to do this. I believe it was intended that when a man is performing Government service with a certain rank he shall receive the pay of that rank. Why this should be as it is I do not know. I have tried to find some way out of it, but I know of no way except to amend the law, and if I offer an amendment to do that a point of order will lie against it under the rule. So, Mr. Chairman, I think it is one of the many unfair things imposed upon officers in the Navy, many times creating hardships and leaving them no opportunity of redress.

They have spent the best years of their lives in the service of their country, and when they have grown old, too late to begin life over again, although in perfect health, the cruel red-tape methods of this department must be inflicted upon them.

It has been decided by the board that the brave officer must go, no matter how it affects him, but it is decreed, and go, go he must to the scrap heap of humanity. [Applause.]

It is an easy matter to smirch the name and reputation of any man, but I am willing to judge a man upon his performance of duty; and when a man with such a brilliant record for faithful performance of duty and for bravery is treated in this manner it is time to modify the law. Mr. Chairman, it is in keeping with what I said on the floor of this House yesterday. Some of the officers in the Navy whom this Government has educated, supported, protected, and pensioned, have not only abused the privileges that have been given them, but they have driven from the service of this Government men with reputation and character superior to theirs.

I have in mind many cases of young men discharged from the Navy whose reputations have been ruined by charges of intoxication, and these men who had been driven out were obliged only a night or two before to take the same officer who had preferred the charges and put the officer into bed.

I am speaking as a matter of justice to men who have served their country faithfully. The Lord knows that we all have our weaknesses. There is no man perfect, and men should be judged on the good things that they do and not always by their weaknesses.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. The commandant of the navy yard is a line officer, and because of his age has served through probably 12 or 15 different sittings of the plucking board, which would indicate that his character and ability must have been very good.

Mr. TAGUE. Yes; and I want to say that I am not here to eulogize anybody, but I have met a great many men in the naval service. I have met many splendid officers, and no one will go further to say a good word for them than I will; but I never met in the service of the Navy a man whose heart was as big as is that of this man, or one who would go further to help his fellow man. There has never been a man, to my mind at least, since I have had the honor to represent the navy-yard district, to whom you could go and who would so willingly help some unfortunate fellow. I know of no man during my time who has served in the Navy of the United States and who has done more to build up the navy yard.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, now that the House is about to complete the consideration of the naval appropriation bill, I take this opportunity to commend and indorse the great work of the popular, faithful, and efficient chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] [applause], and the members of that committee who have acted and cooperated with him in the preparation of this important and far-reaching measure providing for an adequate navy for the defense of the honor, the rights, and the interests of the American people. This bill and the amendments which have been adopted since the President delivered his address to both Houses of Congress last Saturday is the highest and best evidence of the fact that the Members of Congress have laid aside partisan bias, captious objections, and differences of opinion, and are a unit for the proper defense of our common country—are in line and fully determined to aid the President of the United States in his patriotic stand to maintain, uphold, and safeguard the rights of American citizens on the high seas. While I represent a district intensely Republican—not having elected a Democrat to Congress in 60 years [applause]—I am sure I voice the sentiments of Republicans and Democrats in that district in saying they will loyally support the President and the American Congress in maintaining the honor of the Nation, and in protecting the lives and property of American citizens on the high seas, in Mexico, or in any country on the face of the earth.

East Tennessee now and in the future will do her full patriotic duty as she has ever done in the glorious past. She is loyal and ready to answer her country's call. [Applause.]

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. AUSTIN. I always yield to my handsome friend from Illinois.

Mr. BRITTEN. Referring to the last sentence of the gentleman, wherein he says that Tennessee will always come to the call—

Mr. PADGETT. I want to say that there is no question about that.

Mr. BRITTEN. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact and ask the gentleman whether Tennessee has not contributed one of the most able young officers in the American Navy to-day, in the person of Lieut. Charles M. Austin, son of the distinguished gentleman now on the floor?

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, the gentleman embarrasses me. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] move me to say that, along with him and my other colleagues, I hope to see the President sustained in all proper efforts to maintain the honor and dignity of this country. We are considering now one of the great war bills, and the most of us will vote for it even to the limit of those things asked for to sustain the President. While doing that and considering other war bills, it seems to me that we might say to ourselves—whether it is carried over the telegraphic lines to the people of the country or not—that there are many disturbing and conflicting rumors concerning war conditions which are asserted to-day and denied

to-morrow. Yesterday we were informed that an American had been killed on the wrecked steamer *Turino*. His name was George Washington, and, of course, it would occasion a patriotic thrill the whole length and breadth of the country if it was true that George Washington had gone down at the hands of an enemy in foreign waters. But the newspapers had their say yesterday, and they had it again this morning, that this sure-enough American was killed, and therefore we ought to go to war with Germany.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Did this man have any number?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not know. He was an individual of color, but his taking off was supposed to be reason to cause war. Efforts have been made, desperate efforts have been made, since the President was here on Saturday last, to prove that we must go to war. The coasts of the world seem to have been raked to find some overt act to force the President to come in here and ask us to declare war. We have had very little but rumors, but we have had headlines galore, all with a view of stampeding the House and stampeding the country into an act of war. [Applause.] I rose to make this very brief statement because I do not want the people of this country to be deceived. I am satisfied that most of the people of the country want peace; peace with honor, of course. [Applause.] But they do not want to go into a dishonorable war, and they ought not to be forced into a war by the munition makers or the munition users of this or any other land. [Applause.]

Most of the dispatch headlines declaring that American ships have gone down, that American lives have been lost, that international laws have been violated have come from London, and London has been crazy with delight since it heard the glad tidings on Saturday last that the President had severed diplomatic relations with Germany. Coming from the Liberty Bell and Independence Hall district of the United States, I can not forget that we had trouble with London in 1776, and that we had trouble with London in 1812. I am not quite ready to accept all of these rumors that come out of London now without a grain of salt. London is a little more in need of American help just now than we are in need of the advice of London. I am not quite ready, therefore, to believe every damnable, pernicious, and lying report that comes out of London, or to accept it as an inducement to declare my country in a state of war. [Applause.]

On the night of the day that the President appeared here and informed the Congress of the fact that he had severed diplomatic relations with Germany, we had newspaper "extras" announcing in startling headlines that the *Housatonic* had gone down in violation of international law; there were great scare heads, and boys on the streets shouting it aloud. It was declared that American rights had been violated by a country with which we were on friendly terms up to that time. Yet the next day's newspapers announced in smaller type that the *Housatonic* was loaded with contraband, and even our State Department declared that there was no occasion for any warlike declaration in consequence of her sinking.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Is it the contention of the gentleman that because a ship is loaded with contraband, Germany has the right to destroy the lives of passengers and crew?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I made the statement that after all these headlines the State Department declared that there was no breach of international law. The people were being inflamed—

Mr. GORDON. But they did not say it was because the ship was loaded with contraband.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I stated what the gentleman's own Secretary of State announced to the public—he was not as anxious as some newspaper editors are to rush into war.

Mr. GORDON. I agree with much of what the gentleman has said; but—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am not arguing the point of contraband at all. The gentleman is merely taking my time. I am trying to make a plain statement to the House as to the truth and the facts. The gentleman may be stamped because certain things appear in the newspapers, but—

Mr. GORDON. Oh, don't you worry about my being stamped. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am making the statement that we see alarming headlines to-day indicating that we are on the verge of war because some "overt act" has been committed, and the next day the whole thing is denied.

Mr. GORDON. I agree with the gentleman about that.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman tell me what he thinks the duty of this Government ought to be if the German Government has taken charge of and forcibly restrained by order our ambassador in that country?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is carried away with the headlines.

Mr. RAGSDALE. No; he is not.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will listen, I will demonstrate what fools some men are—not like the gentleman from South Carolina, of course—who believe everything they read. I was coming to that very point. For three days we have heard that our American ambassador, who was on excellent terms with everyone in high life in Germany, has "been in captivity" and held for exchange. The gentleman believes that statement.

Mr. RAGSDALE. No; the gentleman does not.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is absurd upon its face. Though we have had it for three days, this morning's newspapers announce that Berlin is in conference with the American ambassador, that conferences have been going on in Berlin, and that the ambassador will be safeguarded out of Germany just as we are going to safeguard the German ambassador out of the United States. Oh, how easy it is for you to rush into war upon the say so of somebody who is interested in having war.

Mr. DYER. His passports have been issued to him.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The ambassador is going to get out safely. Somebody wanted to inflame the American people by declaring that the American ambassador had been held in captivity. Absurd! We have given safe conduct to the German ambassador and are sending him home, and the Germans have been decent with the American ambassador. But at least 2 college professors and about 150 editors, more or less, yesterday declared—not that they were willing to enlist, for the barracks down here are waiting for men like them to come forward and enlist—but they declared in effect that they were willing to involve their country in war because "the American ambassador was held in bondage in Berlin." This morning the newspapers show that those editors and those college professors did not know what they were talking about, and that is what I am trying to say to the gentleman from South Carolina. The plain people should not be fooled. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. One minute.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In that one minute let me say, and I hope not to be interrupted again, that the *Housatonic* alarm has gone glimmering. The State Department seems to concede that the Germans were within their rights and that the *Housatonic* presents no *casus belli*. The next day we had the *California* sensation. Because this ship bore a good old American name everybody was made to suspect that it was an American ship, and that the Germans had perpetrated such an outrage as would force us to go to war. After the sensation had thrilled the country we were quietly informed that the *California* was a British ship, sailing under the British flag, and that she had been given the warning required by international law. But a great deal is made of the fact that one American was aboard that ship. He may have been planted there to protect the cargo and to involve this country in an international warfare; I do not know, but the next day after the newspapers had worked the story of the American passenger to the limit, it developed that he was taken off the ship to a place of safety. It matters not that he was a colored man.

Mr. BRITTEN. And the ship was armed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then, again, Mr. Chairman, the report went broadcast over the United States on the day after the President addressed Congress, that this Government had seized all the interned German ships. These reports were tempered here and there with the suggestion that the German sailors were endeavoring to destroy the property of their own country, but nevertheless it was broadly announced that our

naval officers had seized this German property. I will not stop to discuss the moral aspect of this seizure except to say that there had been no declaration of war and that it was not clear why we should deliberately take this German property and appropriate it to the United States. Within a day or two the answer came from both the State Department and the White House that these German ships had not been seized, and that while this Government was taking certain precautions with respect to possible impediments to navigation, every courtesy was being shown the officers and men in charge of these German vessels. It was evident that some tall lying was done in this instance for the purpose of irritating Germany under very aggravating circumstances. Somebody evidently wanted Germany to commit an "overt act" that would bring on a war. We ought to be on our guard against this dangerous "rumor" business, whether it originates in London or the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts: For fuel; the removal and transportation of ashes and garbage from ships of war; books, blanks, and stationery, including stationery for commanding and navigating officers of ships, chaplains on shore and afloat, and for the use of courts-martial on board ships; purchase, repair, and exchange of typewriters for ships; packing boxes and materials; interior fittings for general storehouses, pay offices, and accounting offices in navy yards; expenses of disbursing officers; coffee mills and repairs thereto; expenses of naval clothing factory and machinery for the same; laboratory equipment; purchase of articles of equipment at home and abroad under the cognizance of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, and for the payment of labor in equipping vessels therewith, and the manufacture of such articles in the several navy yards; musical instruments and music; mess outfits; soap on board naval vessels; athletic outfits; tools, ferriages, yeomen's stores, safes, and other incidental expenses; labor in general storehouses, paymasters' offices, and accounting offices in navy yards and naval stations, including naval stations maintained in island possessions under the control of the United States, and expenses in handling stores purchased and manufactured under "General account of advances"; and reimbursement to appropriations of the Department of Agriculture of cost of inspection of meats and meat food products for the Navy Department: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for chemists and for clerical, inspection, storeman, store laborer, and messenger service in the supply and accounting departments of the navy yards and naval stations and disbursing offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, shall not exceed \$1,400,000; in all, \$2,750,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania, Mr. RAGSDALE, and Mr. CALLAWAY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas, a member of the committee.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the *Record* a statement that I have of how the newspapers of this country have been handled by the munition manufacturers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the *Record* by inserting a certain statement. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask whether it is the gentleman's purpose to insert a long list of extracts from newspapers?

Mr. CALLAWAY. No; it will be a little, short statement, not over 24 inches in length in the *Record*.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent, I insert in the *Record* at this point a statement showing the newspaper combination, which explains their activity in this war matter, just discussed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]:

"In March, 1915, the J. P. Morgan interests, the steel, ship-building, and powder interests, and their subsidiary organizations, got together 12 men high up in the newspaper world and employed them to select the most influential newspapers in the United States and sufficient number of them to control generally the policy of the daily press of the United States.

"These 12 men worked the problem out by selecting 179 newspapers, and then began, by an elimination process, to retain only those necessary for the purpose of controlling the general policy of the daily press throughout the country. They found it was only necessary to purchase the control of 25 of the greatest papers. The 25 papers were agreed upon; emissaries were sent to purchase the policy, national and international, of these papers; an agreement was reached; the policy of the papers was bought, to be paid for by the month; an editor was furnished for each paper to properly supervise and edit information regarding the questions of preparedness, militarism, financial policies, and other things of national and international nature considered vital to the interests of the purchasers.

"This contract is in existence at the present time, and it accounts for the news columns of the daily press of the country

being filled with all sorts of preparedness arguments and misrepresentations as to the present condition of the United States Army and Navy, and the possibility and probability of the United States being attacked by foreign foes.

"This policy also included the suppression of everything in opposition to the wishes of the interests served. The effectiveness of this scheme has been conclusively demonstrated by the character of stuff carried in the daily press throughout the country since March, 1915. They have resorted to anything necessary to commercialize public sentiment and sandbag the National Congress into making extravagant and wasteful appropriations for the Army and Navy under the false pretense that it was necessary. Their stock argument is that it is 'patriotism.' They are playing on every prejudice and passion of the American people."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am in favor of this paragraph in the Navy appropriation bill, because I think the country ought to be fully prepared for any possible invasion; but I think the Congress ought to be careful about encouraging "rumors of war" when war has not actually been declared. Perhaps it would be safe to leave this matter to the President of the United States and to those who have direct knowledge upon the subject. I call attention, however, not only to these false reports of the *Housatonic* and about the *California*, but the steamship *Philadelphia* was reported sunk since the President was here, and yet the next day, after these reports had gone over the country like wildfire and everybody got excited about the *Philadelphia*, which naturally attracted interest in that great city and in the State of Pennsylvania, we found the *Philadelphia* had safely arrived in port, so that report was also in error. Now, whether by design or not I do not know, but it seems that most of these false reports come from London. There seems to be an intense desire there to tell us about German outrages and about American blood shed on foreign ships or to find that some American ship has been shot up. This colored man, George Washington—

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARKLEY. But was not there a statement in the morning paper that the colored man on that ship was a British subject?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am coming to that. The dispatches have made it appear that because of the loss of George Washington, an alleged American citizen, we are now in position to declare war against Germany. This morning's papers have headlines something like this: "Death of American on wrecked *Turino* reported to London. An American negro fireman, George Washington was killed, according to a report received to-day when the British steamship *Turino* was sunk by a German U boat in the war zone."

Now, that is enough to inflame every American—

Mr. FOSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will yield.

Mr. FOSS. I am very much interested in what the gentleman says, but how will the gentleman provide a remedy to stop these international thrills which we are receiving, which the publishers of these newspapers place in their headlines? Would he provide for a censorship of the press?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Not at this time. I simply urge that the true facts and only the true facts be reported at this time when we are at the verge of an outbreak with a foreign country. [Applause.] I think it would be better for some of the editors to "shut up" when they do not know what they are talking about. [Applause.] I think it would be better for some of these professional patriots who have determined our international relations in advance, and who insist upon adjusting our diplomatic affairs in this crisis, to not only "shut up," but go tie a rope around their necks, attach an anchor to it, and jump into the sea. We could better afford to dispense with their meddlesome services than to plunge the people of this country into a foreign war. I think it would be far better for this country. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I regret to say it, but we are gradually turning over the business of Congress, turning over all our constitutional rights, turning over our powers delegated by the people, to a lot of editors, theorists, and college professors who are not capable of conducting our affairs and to whom we should not abdicate.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts after I have disposed of George Washington. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. All I can say then is that the papers report this afternoon that George Washington, the so-

called American, is a British subject; that is all. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend I wish to say that so many rumors and reports of an exaggerated character have appeared during the last few days that even the President, who certainly is as much concerned as any other citizen over the situation that confronts us, should take notice. We are dealing with a serious problem that invites the greatest deliberation. We ought not to be made the pawns of designing men in our own country or of any foreign power that would drag us into a war for selfish purposes. When our President has made up his mind that American honor is at stake and that we must enter upon a war to uphold it, I have no doubt he will find cordial support in the Congress of the United States, but the President has not yet indicated to Congress that the point has been reached where a declaration of war has become necessary. Until the President does come to this body with such information and facts as may warrant further action by Congress, it may not be well to aggravate the situation by giving too much credence to the untruthful rumors that have been bandied about with the evident purpose of finding some reason for provoking a declaration of war. At another time I shall extend in the RECORD, under permission granted to me, certain observations of Mr. Lincoln when he was a Member of the House, with respect to our Mexican complications in 1848. At present I shall content myself by quoting a single sentence from the speech made by Mr. Lincoln January 12 of that year, when he said:

When the war began it was my opinion that all those who, because of knowing too little, or because of knowing too much, could not conscientiously approve the conduct of the President (in the beginning of it) should, nevertheless, as good citizens and patriots remain silent on that point, at least till the war should be ended.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the gentleman that there is too much noise and that the editors of this country may make too much noise. Fortunately the sound of their voices does not penetrate this Hall, while some of the noises which get in here might be suddenly ceased with a great deal of pleasure to some of us who have to stay here.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAGSDALE. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Illinois said he, the gentleman from Illinois, had sense enough to keep still.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I know what he said, but he did not disclose the fact that he had politeness enough, while keeping still, to abide by the rules of the House in undertaking to chide me. That is for the gentleman's information, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MANN. I am abiding by the rules of the House.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is undertaking to lecture me.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Oh, no. I have been lecturing the great editors and the political college professors. I did not have the gentleman in mind at all. [Applause.]

Mr. RAGSDALE. The gentleman's mind is rather limited in its memory.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Surely my mind is not limited when I refer to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RAGSDALE. The gentleman says so little on the floor of this House that he ought to be given an opportunity in everybody's time to be recognized. May I yield further to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore]?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I merely wish to say that when I speak to the gentleman from South Carolina my mind is unlimited.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I am quite sure that is true. There are a great many things the gentleman possesses that are unlimited. His nerve is one of them. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Chairman, undertakes here to tell us about getting excited over the newspapers, and he undertakes to read from the newspapers, then proving that the conditions in Germany are not what they are reported to be in other newspapers. Now, why should we accept the statement from the newspapers selected by the gentleman any more than he would accept the statements made by other newspapers which he has not selected? I say to the gentleman that I quite agree with him that the people of our country ought not to be excited or hurried into war, but I say to the gentleman, sympathetic as I am with the people who want to preserve peace here, that if Germany has placed a restraining hand upon our ambassador, who went there in good faith to represent this Government, as a Representative of my people I wish to exhaust every power within our command to bring him back here without regard to cost.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAGSDALE. Certainly.

Mr. DYER. I will state to the gentleman that the Washington Times of to-day states that the ambassador has been given his passports and that he has never been detained at all.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I will say to my friend that he ought to take advice from the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and not be misled by the newspaper headlines.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAGSDALE. To both at one time. Let us have a "talk-fest." Go to it.

Mr. DYER. He has been furnished a special train to Switzerland by the German Government.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know that the Washington Post, a very reliable newspaper, states that there was a conference yesterday on this subject in Berlin? Now, possibly the gentleman is the spokesman of the Department of State, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] is the spokesman of the White House. I would like him to say whether or not he knows that this conference took place in Berlin yesterday, in which the American ambassador bore an honorable part.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that my information does not come solely from the newspapers. And I did not say that I was the spokesman of anybody or any thing except the people of the sixth district of South Carolina.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Now we are getting the news.

Mr. RAGSDALE. And I say that what I stated is true, and it can not be disproven.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Improvement of construction plants: For repairs and improvements of machinery and implements at construction plants at navy yards at Portsmouth, N. H., \$10,000; Boston, Mass., \$25,000; New York, N. Y., \$35,000; Philadelphia, Pa., \$25,000; Norfolk, Va., \$35,000; Charleston, S. C., \$10,000; Mare Island, Cal., \$35,000; Puget Sound, Wash., \$25,000; in all, \$200,000.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman a question. Under the improvement of construction plants just read, \$200,000, on page 41, there is an appropriation for Boston, Mass., of \$25,000, and approximately the same appropriation is made for Boston, on page 44, under machinery plants. What is the condition?

Mr. PADGETT. They are in different bureaus or departments. One is in the Bureau of Construction and Repair, and deals with the hulls, and the other is in the Steam Engineering Department, that deals with the machinery and implements, and so forth, inside of the shops.

Mr. SEARS. The appropriations are so nearly similar that—

Mr. PADGETT. One relates to hulls. They are in different bureaus.

Mr. FOSS. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question in regard to Coast Guard cutters. Where are they being built now?

Mr. PADGETT. They are not being built at all. They could not get a bid within the limit of cost.

Mr. FOSS. Are they going to be built in navy yards or by private contract?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know. The award is to be made by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MANN. I believe you called these navy-yard plants construction plants before.

Mr. PADGETT. I will say to the gentleman that the only difference is that we have grouped it all into one paragraph. Heretofore we referred to it as repairs and improvements of machinery and implements at navy yards.

Mr. MANN. You did not use the word "construction" heretofore.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir; it is the same language, and then it was repeated in reference to every yard.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is in error, but I do not know that it makes any great difference.

The Clerk read as follows:

The limit of cost of one steam Coast Guard cutter for service as anchorage patrol boat in New York Harbor, authorized by the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," approved August 29, 1916, to be, and hereby is, increased from \$125,000 to \$185,000.

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a point of order on the paragraph relating to Coast Guard cutters.

Mr. PADGETT. That increases the limit of cost.

Mr. MANN. It is clearly subject to a point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. That is the limit of cost. We provided for that last year.

Mr. MANN. I understand the situation. The Navy Department has no business to interfere with these matters. Of course, you put it in the naval bill last year, and you had no business to do that. You brought in a rule that covered it. The Committee on Naval Affairs does not have jurisdiction of it.

Mr. PADGETT. If the gentleman makes a point of order, I will say that it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. Does the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois begin at line 11?

Mr. MANN. It commences with line 11.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MANN. I also make a point of order on the rest of the page.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understood the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, while we are considering this section, in reference to the Bureau of Construction and Repair, I think it not inappropriate to call the attention of the committee to the naval disasters which have been suffered by this country in the past year. As near as I can ascertain, we have lost more ships, in number, by accident—that is, by accident pure and simple—in the last year than Great Britain, although she has been engaged in a war, in the course of the operations of which it was necessary to navigate long and unlighted coasts, among the great dangers resulting therefrom.

Probably all the Members of the House remember the recent accident to the *U-3*, one of our submarines, which went ashore on the Pacific coast, at the entrance of Humboldt Bay, Cal. That accident seems to have been caused either by poor seamanship or negligence. A still worse accident soon followed, when the cruiser *Milwaukee*, in attempting to pull out the submarine, was trapped in some way by the tidal currents and drawn on one of the treacherous shoals of that coast, so that a fine vessel, a fine cruiser of nearly 10,000 tons, costing almost \$4,000,000—in fact, one of the most useful cruisers that our Navy possesses—is now, as I understand it, a total wreck.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Does not the gentleman think the department was at fault rather than the officers in ordering a ship like the *Milwaukee* to do that kind of work, when an ordinary salvage company would have undertaken that work for about \$18,000?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not think there is so much fault to be imputed to the navigating officer of the *Milwaukee* as there is to the department or the higher official that ordered a vessel of this class to attempt that kind of work. A vessel of the cruiser class was entirely unfitted for such work. The vessel drew over 22 feet of water. It was on a treacherous coast, full of shoals, where strong currents endangered it. A powerful tug that did not require much more than half the depth of water would have done better work. The expense, as the gentleman from Delaware says, would not have been great, and we would have preserved a much-needed vessel.

But this is not the only accident our Navy has suffered recently. The cruiser *Memphis* was sunk in the harbor of Santo Domingo, with a loss of 40 lives. That accident was probably without any fault on the part of the officers controlling the vessel or navigating it; but we lost a powerful armored cruiser of 14,500 tons—more powerful probably than any cruiser of its class in any navy, which cost over \$6,000,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; always to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PADGETT. I am told that that was caused by an upheaval, perhaps a submarine volcano, that just rose right up under it and tore the ship in twain, and landed lava and other stuff right in the ship.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think there was no fault to be attached to the management of the vessel at that time. But about a month prior to that we lost a fuel ship, the *Hector*, off the coast of Charleston, S. C. I am informed that the *Hector* at that time was in charge of a civilian crew, but I assume, although I am not informed as to that matter, that it was commanded by a naval officer.

In May, 1916, the mine planter *San Francisco* struck a shoal near Chatham Light, and was laid up for repairs for several months, and last summer the destroyer *Terry* struck a reef off Puerto Plata, Santo Domingo, and was beached. Her commander was tried for negligence, but was acquitted.

Last fall the fuel ship *Jupiter* got into collision with an Italian bark, and I believe the commander was court-martialed and acquitted. Last year, in March, the destroyer *Monaghan* was rammed by the destroyer *Roe*, at Key West. The commander of the *Roe* was tried and reduced three numbers in his grade.

The American Navy has had a proud record in the past. The officers have been noted for their gallantry and seamanship, and it is peculiarly unfortunate, it seems to me, that at this particular time we should have to chronicle the loss of so many vessels, with so many disasters. Some of them, unfortunately, can not be attributed to anything else but negligence or bad seamanship. We would prefer to turn from such a record to that which was made in past years; to recall those commanders of American ships who distinguished themselves as the captain of the *Constitution* did, when he escaped by clever seamanship from a British ship; to return to the time when the gallantry was so distinguished, as it was when a commander of a vessel sinking under the enemy's fire preferred to go down with his ship to being saved with the rest of his crew. It is to be hoped that the department will take notice of the condition of affairs, and that a discipline more strict, and a greater efficiency will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay of professors and others, Naval Academy: Pay of professors and instructors, including one professor as librarian, \$175,000.

No part of any sum in this act appropriated shall be expended in the pay or allowances of any commissioned officer of the Navy detailed for duty as an instructor at the United States Naval Academy to perform duties which were performed by civilian instructors on January 1, 1913—

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman—

The Clerk continued to read as follows:

One sword master, \$1,600; 1 assistant, \$1,400; and 1 assistant, \$1,200; 1 headmaster in physical training, \$1,700; 1 instructor in physical training, \$1,700; and 2 instructors in physical training, at \$1,400 each; 3 instructors in physical training, at \$1,200 each; 1 assistant librarian, \$2,400; 1 cataloguer, \$1,500; and 1 shelf assistant, \$1,100; 1 shelf assistant, \$900; 1 secretary of the Naval Academy, \$2,400; 2 clerks, at \$1,700 each; 4 clerks, at \$1,400 each; 4 clerks, at \$1,100 each; 4 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 7 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 1 clerk, \$900; 6 clerks, at \$840 each; 1 draftsman, \$1,400; 1 surveyor, \$1,400; services of organist at chapel, \$300; 1 captain of the watch, \$1,100; 1 second captain of the watch, \$1,000; 22 watchmen, at \$900 each; 3 telephone switchboard operators, at \$600 each; 1 mail messenger, \$1,000. In all, pay of professors and others, Naval Academy, \$255,440.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois make the point of order or reserve it?

Mr. MANN. I reserve it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves the point of order.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, are we treating this bill by sections or by paragraphs?

The CHAIRMAN. By paragraphs.

Mr. SEARS. I asked for the recognition of the Chair before.

The CHAIRMAN. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not understand that the gentleman wanted recognition until the end of the paragraph.

Mr. SEARS. Yes; I wanted to speak under the item of pay of professors. That is a paragraph.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I notice this carries quite a number of increases of salaries.

Mr. SEARS. Then I thought I would wait until we got to that point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair noticed the gentleman rise.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SEARS. I tried to get recognition for the purpose of discussing the first paragraph.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Florida is slightly in error. He rose. I saw him rise, and then I saw him sit down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to make this statement: The gentleman from Florida did rise and address the Chair.

Mr. SEARS. I said "Mr. Chairman." I do not know how else I could have done.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the gentleman took his seat, and the Chair thought he did not want recognition at that time. I am sorry the Chair did not recognize the gentleman when he rose.

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether there is any intention to have a general provision in this bill in reference to increased salaries or not. I do not think it is quite fair to give specific increases and then give the same party the benefit of a general

increase where that was not the thought of the committee originally.

Mr. PADGETT. There is no thought of offering any other amendment than what is in the bill with reference to any increases of any kind. We have reported the specific ones here. In the reorganization of the Navy under the provisions of the act of August 29 it involved—

Mr. MANN. There was a sort of understanding in the House when we passed the legislative bill that any increase finally agreed upon in that law would probably be carried in other bills, at least as to the same classes of employees.

Mr. PADGETT. Under the Naval Academy appropriation here—

Mr. MANN. Of course almost everything in this bill is in the regular Naval Establishment.

Mr. PADGETT. It is in here, and we have taken care of those specifically.

Mr. TALBOTT. The Secretary recommended the increases.

Mr. MANN. So far as the gentleman knows, there is no intention of making a percentage increase in this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir.

Mr. MANN. I suppose this increase in the number of employees over there is necessary by reason of the increase in the number of midshipmen.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] insist on his point of order?

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I trust the few remarks I shall make will not be misunderstood. It is only in the hope that at some future time some reform may be obtained. I do not care to get in this House the title of watchdog of the Treasury; on the contrary, I desire to assure you I will go to the fullest extent in making any appropriation that is necessary. I am for preparedness when I think preparedness is necessary. As my State extends out into the ocean and the gulf, our citizens realize perhaps more than the citizens of any other State the importance of naval preparedness. But a few moments ago I called attention to the fact that there were 900 retired military officers in this country, and that I did not believe those gentlemen would care to be referred to as old, worn-out, broken-down horses.

When I look over this Chamber and see the activity of my young colleague, Uncle Joe Cannon, of Illinois, and my good friend Gen. SHERWOOD, of Ohio, it seems to me that these retired naval officers, who have been trained in an open-air life, should at least be active enough at 45 to 64 to keep them at the Naval Academy at Annapolis as instructors. By the report which I hold in my hand it appears that last year 38 additional civilians were employed as instructors at this academy. In the present bill in all, under "Pay of professors and others, Naval Academy," there is carried an appropriation of \$430,440 compared to \$413,860 last year, or approximately a \$17,000 increase. There are at the Naval Academy to-day about 1,200 students. The full quota is 1,700 students. At that rate the instructors, teachers, cooks, butchers, and bakers are paid approximately \$253 per pupil, if the entire 1,700 were at Annapolis. There are only 1,200 there. I do not know, but I have been told that the cost of each student at Annapolis per annum is something like \$4,500. I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that in selecting young men to go to Annapolis it has been my pleasure and my pride to select boys who were not able to pay their way through any college, but who as American boys are ambitious to get an education. I believe when you spend upon a boy the sum of \$4,500 per annum for his education instead of assisting him in making him a better citizen you come nearer to making him nothing but a parlor-carpet young man who believes only in wearing gold epaulets and having gold all around him; and I do not believe these young men should be brought up in that manner; nor do I believe the young men desire to be brought up in that manner. For four years it was my pleasure to go to a military establishment, and there we did not have to employ watchmen. In this bill 22 watchmen are provided for at salaries. I can not see why these young Americans could not be detailed, as I was detailed, to serve their turn and save this expense, small though it may be, to the Government. What I say may not save anything to the country, but I believe the people are finally going to wake up to the fact that we are spending too much at these colleges, not so much to educate the young men to defend the country, but to educate them so they may go out and be society entertainers. I believe, Mr. Chairman, we could well afford to pass some law whereby these retired Army officers could be sent to Annapolis to instruct these young men, be-

cause they should be better able to teach them than any civilian.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word merely for the purpose of making a single observation. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS] said he understood the cost at Annapolis was \$4,500 a year for each student. I have had the impression from what the gentlemen have said that it cost the Government of the United States \$50,000, at least, for every man who was graduated from Annapolis.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. MANN. I will yield for any information.

Mr. PADGETT. We had some reports on that two or three years ago, and one estimate was that it cost about \$15,000 to graduate a young man. Another ran it up to about \$18,000 or \$19,000. It varied.

Mr. MANN. That depends on what you compute.

Mr. PADGETT. That included interest on the investment of about \$14,000,000 that is invested in the buildings.

Mr. MANN. I do not think that computation even charges the salaries of the officers who are over there. They go on the theory that they are already in the Naval Establishment.

Mr. PADGETT. That was included as an item also.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order to ask a question. I would like to inquire of the chairman if the estimates he has given the committee relative to the expense of educating a student at Annapolis are based upon the number who are now in attendance, 1,200?

Mr. PADGETT. No; that was based upon the former number of 800.

Mr. DOWELL. Can the chairman give to the committee a statement of what additional expense there would be if the number were increased to the capacity of 1,700?

Mr. PADGETT. Perhaps \$150,000 more.

Mr. DOWELL. In the aggregate?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. It would require perhaps a little more than that, say \$200,000.

Mr. DOWELL. Of course, there is a greater expense for 1,700 than there is for 800.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; the great bulk of the expense in the larger estimate was the interest on the \$14,000,000 investment, the maintenance, upkeep, repairs, heat, all those charges that are fixed charges. They do not increase with the increased number.

Mr. DOWELL. As I understand the chairman, we could educate 1,700 for practically the same amount as 800?

Mr. PADGETT. Not practically; but I think about \$200,000 more.

Mr. MANN. We will have to rebuild the academy. We have spent \$14,000,000 on the Naval Academy since I have been a Member of the House, and if you make a further increase, you will have to expend that much more.

Mr. PADGETT. The present authorization runs the number up to about 1,800—I am speaking of the operating expenses and the enlargement of the Naval Academy—we have a provision in here for enlarging it to accommodate the increased number.

Mr. DOWELL. As I understand, in order to have the 1,700 there must be provision for enlarging the academy.

Mr. MANN. There has to be an enlargement of the academy, anyhow. We built the academy before the census of 1900 was taken. We increased the representation; each Member and Senator only had 1 cadet, and the President only had 10. Now, we have given the Secretary of the Navy a bunch of them, increased the number to the President, increased the representation in both House and Senate, and given to each Member twice as many as he had before.

Mr. PADGETT. Three times as many as it was when I came here.

Mr. MANN. And yet they said when they built the academy that they were making the limit as close as they could. It was not built with the idea of giving each Member of Congress two or three cadets.

Mr. DOWELL. At any rate, from the answers of the chairman, I understand that the fewer the number of cadets at Annapolis the greater the percentage of expense.

Mr. PADGETT. Per capita, yes; because you divide the overhead charges by a smaller number.

Mr. MANN. There are no overhead charges.

Mr. PADGETT. There is the interest on the investment.

Mr. MANN. You will have to build accommodations for every new cadet.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In the bill we are now appropriating \$824,729.20 for the Naval Academy at Annapolis. That alone amounts to \$6,873 for each of the 1,200 cadets there.

Mr. PADGETT. Does the gentleman take into consideration that we propose an enlargement of the academy?

Mr. NORTON. How much is to be used for that? I do not believe any amount is provided for that here.

Mr. PADGETT. I beg the gentleman's pardon; what I had reference to is under public works.

Mr. NORTON. I quite agree with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS] that it appears that the system they are practicing at the Naval Academy is the same system carried out by the Army and Navy officers in their work in the field. They do not want a soldier to do any manual labor of any kind if it can be avoided; it is repulsive to most officers to do anything but drill and dress up. That is the policy that is being carried out as I have frequently observed it. It seems to me that in the Naval Academy it is an outrage that it should cost the Government about \$10,000 a year to educate a midshipman.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman has made an error of one cipher in his division. The gentleman said it was \$6,000 for each cadet, whereas it is \$600.

Mr. NORTON. The gentleman is right—that does make a decided difference. My calculation made on the total appropriation stated in the bill was not correct.

Mr. SEARS. I understood the chairman to say that it required \$16,000 or \$18,000 to educate a cadet at Annapolis.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; including the interest on the \$14,000,000 investment; the salaries of the officers, and counting in the pay of officers detailed for this duty, it amounts to that in the aggregate. But when you take the operating expenses, you have all that in the bill before you. For 1,200 cadets it would be so much, and if you had 1,700 cadets it would be less. Of course, if you had 1,700 cadets you would have to increase the number of professors, instructors, mess boys, and cooks.

Mr. NORTON. This appropriation does not, of course, cover all the expenses of the academy. I understood the gentleman [Mr. PADGETT] to say that the expenses of educating a midshipman for four years was about \$50,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, no; there have been two estimates. One was about \$15,000 and the other about \$18,000 or \$19,000, as I recollect.

Mr. NORTON. Then I misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. PADGETT. That is for the four years, and it includes the expenses of maintenance, upkeep, officers' salaries, interest on the \$14,000,000 invested, and all that.

The Clerk read as follows:

Departments of electrical engineering and physics: Three electrical machinists, at \$1,180 each; 2 mechanics, at \$1,180 each; 1 laboratorian, \$1,000; in all, \$6,900.

Mr. McCRACKEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I think there must be something very wrong at the Naval Academy. About one year ago I appointed a young man to take the entrance examination, which he passed after he had made preparation here. He went to the Naval Academy and served until about 10 days ago, when he was notified that he had failed in one or two subjects of the semiannual examination held last month. I think he failed in French and also in Spanish. He was not the only one who failed; there were 60 others who failed to pass the examination. I asked him what the real trouble was. He said that there was a certain man there who was a teacher of a foreign language, the man being a foreigner himself, and the boy said the only reason he failed was because this foreign teacher had a prejudice against him. I think that is entirely wrong. Here is a boy who has gone to considerable trouble and expense to make his preparation. He had prepared here in the city of Washington for at least a year. He passed the entrance examination about a year ago; was admitted to the Naval Academy and served for something like eight months and is now dismissed. I am satisfied, after making my own examination of this boy's case, that he has been wronged, and I would like to know from some one—

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCRACKEN. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Did the gentleman appeal to the academic board of the Naval Academy?

Mr. McCRACKEN. I have not had time. The boy has been dismissed and was told to go home.

Mr. BUTLER. When was he dismissed?

Mr. McCRACKEN. Just about 10 days ago.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is it not a conditional dismissal, and will he not have 60 days within which to prepare himself to take the examination over in those subjects in which he was deficient?

Mr. McCRACKEN. No; it is an absolute dismissal, because he has passed the age of 20 years, and he can not be admitted to another examination.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Can he not make up those conditions in those subjects?

Mr. McCracken. No; not at all.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman that I have a young man in the same position; although he served through his fourth class and was in his third, he failed in three of his studies. It is within the power of the academic board to put him back in a lower class. In this case they refused, but I have the privilege of appointing him again to take the examinations held in April, which I am going to do. Fortunately he is not 20 years of age, but I want to say to the gentleman that none of these boys were discharged. Every one was given the privilege of resigning, which they did.

Mr. McCracken. Let me explain right there that I asked in regard to this so-called resignation and find that it is a forced resignation.

Mr. BROWNING. That is true.

Mr. BUTLER. That is true.

Mr. BROWNING. But they were not discharged. In the Military Academy they are discharged outright.

Mr. McCracken. It amounts to the same thing.

Mr. BROWNING. Oh, no.

Mr. BUTLER. I am sorry the gentleman did not know of the remedy which the gentleman from New Jersey suggested. That boy might have been put back in the next class and his graduation postponed a year longer, which often occurs.

Mr. McCracken. But he has passed the age of 20 years.

Mr. BUTLER. That would make no difference, because he was admitted to the Academy when he was 19. There is no time limit set for graduation; it is for admission. The boy was already admitted there, and I am sorry that the gentleman finds himself in an awkward situation. If he consulted the Secretary of the Navy, there might yet be a remedy.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chair, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCracken. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I was about to suggest that my candidate met with the same result, but I am not ready to state that it was not his fault. He was appointed after a competitive examination that I held, and he made very high marks upon the entrance. I thought he had an assured career, but in the work at the Academy he fell below the requirements. I am rather of the opinion that the rigidity over at the Academy is not to be charged against the teachers as any particular prejudice against the students. I do not believe that exists. I think that our boys simply do not get into the rigid methods of study that they require over there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. McCracken. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes, two minutes to be granted to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], one minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], and two minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already recognized the gentleman from Idaho for five minutes. The gentleman will proceed, and at the conclusion of that time the Chair will put the request of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman from Idaho to make the statement that they were employing foreign teachers over there. Is it a fact that they employ foreigners to teach in the Naval Academy?

Mr. McCracken. I am advised that there are instructors teaching foreign languages in the Naval Academy who have been in this country only a very short time. I do not know as to their citizenship. But these boys who are sent here from the farm and all parts of the country to this school come back and tell us they do not get any help there, and that is one reason also why they fall down on their examinations, and if that be true, it is time that somebody was making an investigation of the Naval Academy, especially of the gentlemen who constitute the faculty of that institution.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCracken. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I think there is some foundation for what the gentleman says in regard to the foreign teacher teaching the foreign language. The rigid methods of both France and Germany in the schoolrooms are not what we use in this country, and our boys are not used to getting down and boning as they do over there. I think it is more difficult to meet the requirements of a teacher from France, for example, teaching French,

or a teacher from Germany teaching German, but the fault is not altogether with the teacher. It is because our boys do not meet the requirements, and I think our friend will admit that he never knew a pupil to fail when it was not the teacher's fault.

Mr. McCracken. I grant that is the case many times.

Mr. PADGETT. I want to say to the gentleman from Idaho that the passing mark at the Naval Academy is only 62½ per cent out of 100, which is a very low passing mark; so I think there is some unjust criticism of these teachers when you take into consideration that 62½ per cent of 100 is the passing mark, which is certainly not a severe standard.

Mr. McCracken. I would like to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that there were 600 boys at the Naval Academy last year, and of that number more than 60 have resigned, which is tantamount to dismissal.

Mr. PADGETT. Sixty of the whole school; that takes in the whole school?

Mr. BROWNING. That is right, because my young man is in the third class.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman speaks of that as unusual. At the University of Virginia, while I was a student there, 89 men applied for a law degree and 30 got it. It was an unusually large class, and I think the average of the college will show that there are more severe examinations and a harder test than at either Annapolis or West Point.

Mr. PADGETT. It is a hard standard, and a higher passing mark.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the gentleman realize it is absolutely necessary to have the midshipmen comply with the requirements of the professorial force rather than have the midshipmen determine their own standard of scholarship?

Mr. McCracken. I will grant that; but I want to say that these boys do not get the help from the teachers at the Naval Academy, who are paid by the Government, which they ought to get.

Mr. STAFFORD. Boys are boys while attending either college or the Naval Academy, and they themselves know that if they do not apply themselves as assiduously as they should in order to make their lessons they will fail. Boys who want to make their lessons pass.

Mr. McCracken. The gentleman has simply assumed that.

Mr. STAFFORD. I know that from my experience in college, and I do not think there is any different status as far as the boys at the Naval Academy are concerned.

Mr. McCracken. Would the gentleman from Wisconsin be in favor of giving a boy a chance to make up his deficiency?

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, I do not think a boy should be thrown out just because of one deficiency. I do not think he is thrown out if he merely fails in one study, but if he is deficient in more than one it is assumed he has not the mental capacity to meet the requirements of the test when in active service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I went to school from the time I was a small boy until I graduated at college at the age of 19. [Applause.] Oh, I doubt very much whether when I was graduated at the age of 19 I could have passed the present requirements for admission to the Naval Academy. I know I could not unless I probably crammed for that purpose. Now, I have been a student all my life in school, and after graduating at college I took a course in a law school and was graduated at a law school. Now it would require three or four years at a law school, and if I had been going to a medical school as conducted now it would have required four years; and yet what do we require? We admit a boy at the Naval Academy at the age of 16, I believe, and it makes considerable difference in his windup whether he goes in at the age of 16 or at the age of 20. It makes a difference whether he retires as a rear admiral if he lives. We expect a boy at Annapolis to learn all that a man is expected to learn at an ordinary classical college and various other colleges and universities, and in addition to that to become the most perfectly drilled man on earth. No other men drill like the boys at Annapolis and West Point; at least I never have seen any; certainly they are not in the Army or the Navy outside of those graduates. Then we expect them to know something of seamanship, something of gunnery, something of navigation, something of international law, something of a great many other things, and the human mind is not sufficient to grasp all of those things at the age of 20, no matter how much study one can put in, and the result is that lots of boys who go to Annapolis, who would make just as fine officers as anybody who was ever graduated, get plucked on their way through. I never had that unfortunate occurrence come to any of my appointees, I believe, but I have had a good deal of difficulty getting boys into Annapolis and they have managed to stay when they got in; that is

my recollection, although I am not so sure about that. If a man is going to study medicine, he will go through high school. He will not leave high school by the time he is 16. He will go through college, and he will not leave college now by the time he is 20, and then he will go through a medical school, and he will not leave that before he is 25, and then he will have to go out and be an interne in a hospital for two years, and after that he has got to go out and hang his shingle out and do a lot of work for nothing before he really commences his real professional work, and yet we suppose that a second lieutenant in the Navy is competent to man a vessel, and often he is required to do so; to know how to keep the country out of international difficulty and how to navigate a vessel. No wonder we have had a lot of naval vessels on the rocks.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes as I indicated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of asking the chairman of this committee a question. He made a statement a few minutes ago that we had three midshipmen there.

Mr. PADGETT. I did not say you had them there, but I said that you could appoint them.

Mr. EMERSON. I have not got three there yet.

Mr. PADGETT. Perhaps your predecessor had the places filled.

Mr. EMERSON. I am not supposed to have had any predecessor.

Mr. PADGETT. You had not?

Mr. EMERSON. No; it is a new district.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not understand that. There has not been any apportionments since 1910, when your State was redistricted; but your appointment came from the Congressman at large, I presume.

Mr. EMERSON. I do not know. Maybe he did not appoint from my district.

Mr. PADGETT. Whomever you succeeded had the places filled. There are three appointments for each Senator and for each congressional district.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Did we not create a new cadet during this present Congress?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Did not the gentleman from Ohio get that appointment? A new cadet was authorized for each Member at this present Congress.

Mr. EMERSON. I have not got even that.

Mr. PADGETT. There was an additional one created in the last session for each Member.

Mr. EMERSON. I have not had an appointee even under that.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman is entitled to it.

Mr. EMERSON. I did not get it. I have called at the department and I have not gotten it.

Mr. KELLEY. My impression is, and it may be an explanation in this case, that if there was an appointment at large by some Member from your State in that district, that that would count from your district.

Mr. BUTLER. No; it would come from the State at large.

Mr. SABATH. Your Republican colleagues might have gotten away with the appointment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have had some experience in the appointment of these cadets at Annapolis and have had several boys graduate from there, but I want to say that there is one thing about the Naval Academy I do not understand. Perhaps it is imaginary, but I know from experience that I have never named the son of an officer that he was not admitted, and always they were permitted to graduate. I believe that there is some foundation for the charge that is frequently made, that the sons of naval officers receive additional help at that institution that permits him to graduate. I do not know whether that is true or not, but I do know that I have never had a boy fall who was an officer's son, and I have appointed some of them. When it comes to West Point, perhaps I have been unfortunate. It may be I am unfortunate in the young men that I have in my district, but I have been a Member of this body for almost 14 years and I have never yet had a man graduate at the Military Academy. Never have I

been able to get a boy in West Point that they did not find something the matter with him, usually a physical defect.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, can I have one minute, that I may raise my voice in this experience meeting?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I would like to say to the gentleman from Washington that if he would have his boys come to Florida and stay a while, I think we would give them a physical make-up that would enable them to get through.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If you did, I think you would do something with the efficiency of the Naval Academy rather than the boys.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, since I have been a Representative in this House I presume I have named 12 boys to Annapolis, and have never had one fail after admission. I have appointed them directly, with but very few exceptions. They are prepared in advance. I have never heard one of them say that they were suspicious that the son of an officer had better treatment and better advantage than the son of a civilian. And the boys I have named, with one exception, have all come from civil life—have been the sons of men in civil life.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentlemen yield for a moment there?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. Is it not a fact that at the present time the head man of their teams down there—the president of the class—is from the enlisted force?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; he comes from the enlisted force.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Department of seamanship: Two coxswains, at \$480 each; 3 seamen, at \$420 each; in all, \$2,220.

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. EAGLE. If any of the gentlemen of this House have ever had any gratification, any satisfaction, in the matter of appointing cadets to West Point and to Annapolis, I congratulate him. I have had nothing but disappointment from beginning to end.

When the matter arose of my selecting young gentlemen to our Naval and Military Academies, I concluded to give the civil-service plan a fair and impartial trial in my district.

I have had 19 young gentlemen, first and last, write me requesting that I designate them either to West Point or to Annapolis. I had 178 persons write me separate and distinct letters saying favorable things concerning one or the other of those 19 applicants. I wanted for once to rise to the stature of a disinterested statesman, and accordingly I announced that not for political or personal considerations but purely upon the merit of applicants such appointments would be made. I have two vacancies at West Point and three at Annapolis. The candidates must be so many years old, weigh so many pounds, have flawless eyes, fine intelligence, a good education, and good morals; and hence I announced a civil-service examination to determine qualifications, and so I got the Civil Service Commission to hold the examination recently. I am not complaining about its work; I am talking about how the civil-service plan has worked in this matter.

Here is what happened: The civil service held such examination in my city of Houston, at the post office, beginning at 10 o'clock in the morning on January 10 of this year. Three months before that time, in order that everybody might have information concerning the examination, I had copies of instructions made on the multigraph, setting out the requirements of the Navy Department for admission to Annapolis and of the War Department for admission to West Point.

Having done that—and it filled an entire page—I mailed a copy to each newspaper in my district, a copy to each of those 19 young gentlemen, and a copy to each of those 178 persons who had written to me extolling the virtues of those 19 young gentlemen; and with the notice thus duly given, the time fairly stated, and the place duly set, when the commission properly constituted sat to pass upon the qualifications of all the applicants in my district, only two young gentlemen came to take the examination, and one of them made 60 and the other 75 per cent. [Laughter.]

Now, what should I do about it? I do not know.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Appoint them! [Laughter.]

Mr. EAGLE. Appoint whom? Appoint the two? The other three did not even apply, and were evidently not willing to stand the necessary examination. And now I am having many letters from some of those young gentlemen and their friends urging their selection, notwithstanding they were not willing to un-

dergo an examination to test their fitness. It would seem that the public and our constituents will not let us divest ourselves of the plague of patronage even when we earnestly try to divest ourselves of it.

What are you going to do about it? We can not have an efficient army corps and we can not have an efficient naval corps based on my preference when I do not know, or based on the preference of Senators and Representatives who do not know, the physical, educational, moral, and mental qualifications of applicants or candidates. You can not decide it sensibly at random. It is a pure guess.

Now, when I tried to be a disinterested statesman and a civil-service reformer, and not a politician, to appoint on merit alone, that is the result. I do not know what to do about it. If any of you gentlemen have solved the problem, I would be thankful to you. [Laughter.]

Seriously, it is a painful service we are called upon to perform—to dispense patronage of any kind. No matter whom we select we are criticized, if not even abused. Even where we do not seek the responsibility it is forced upon us. If we select our enemies, our friends accuse us of ingratitude. If we select our friends, our enemies accuse us of intolerance and clannishness. And when we invite the civil service to aid us—by testing applicants in order to enable us to select the best qualified—we are accused of cowardice in trying to evade responsibility. And when notice is given and expense is incurred, even then the applicants do not come forward to stand the examination. But afterwards they and their friends write us to please designate them because of friendship.

In all other matters and at all other times I have decided each contest coming before me with the best lights before me—undergoing the toll and observing the courtesies and entailing the consequences. Having now fairly tried out both plans, I have found such to be the only sensible course to pursue. But I could wish for no other blessing in public life quite equal to that of being relieved entirely from patronage. It kills time, makes enemies, belittles endeavor, and injures our opportunities to give to the public service the best of energy and talent we possess, but it is inevitable, because it is the people's way of conducting their own Government. [Applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in six minutes, one-half to be used by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] and one-half to be used by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in six minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] is recognized.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I have no fault to find with the Naval Academy, although I have heard a great deal of criticism of it. I am inclined to think that the failure of our applicants is due more to themselves than to the authorities of the academy.

But I am interested in knowing how a man like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] can in 20 years make appointments and never miss them by having every applicant succeed.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. I take the chance of criticism by selecting the boy. That boy is usually selected by me two years in advance. When he is prepared and admitted he never fails, and I think five or six of my boys have been graduated near the head of their class.

Mr. FESS. How do you select them?

Mr. BUTLER. By my personal knowledge. I select boys that I know—rich or poor, it matters not to me, so that the boy can stand up—and have the boy's parents and neighbors, in a sense, in part responsible for his success.

Mr. FESS. I am much obliged to my friend. My colleague here from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] says he has not had a failure, and there are others who say they have not.

Now, I have only one ambition in reference to Annapolis and West Point, and that is to get good sailors and good soldiers. I have tried to select them by competitive examination, believing this to be the best way to insure the best choice, yet this year what would be called the "star" applicant whom I recommended is out, I suppose, by a forced resignation, which is a great disappointment to me. As I just remarked, I have no fault to find with the authorities over there, understand. I suppose my method of procedure is at fault.

Mr. BUTLER. I think it is not a good one. I think the gentleman's knowledge of the candidate would be much more

useful to the candidate when that knowledge is more than what he could get through a competitive examination.

Mr. FESS. There is another question I would like to propound to some one who can answer me. One of the candidates that I was very anxious might have a chance—because I happened to know his parents, and they are not wealthy, and this is a very promising as well as deserving young man—was also in the examination, and was also recommended for Annapolis. He failed to enter; that is, he failed on the entrance examination. Then I took it up to see whether I could get him a re-trial, and I was denied it, but was told that there was a certain board that I should apply to. The Bureau of Navigation notified me that he was not included in the list recommended for another examination. I applied to the academic board and was politely informed that the case was carefully considered, after which the board decided to deny him permission to appear to take another examination.

Mr. BUTLER. I fear I may have misled my friend—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman could reappoint him. I may have misled the gentleman. Within the last two or three years I have endeavored to assist by appointing directly from among boys whom I have known well in my district, hoping we could help them reach the mark. It is true they could not take the first examination on every occasion, but the boys who succeeded in entering the academy have done very well and in no case failed.

Mr. FESS. My familiarity with young men as students leads me to know how often the first examination does not establish the ability of the applicant. It appears, to say the least, a singular decision for any academic board to deny flatly the solicitation on behalf of a young man's desire to prove his worth, of the appointing authority, who doubtless knows more about the young man's qualifications than a single examination will show. While as a man who has spent his life in college circles I give no credence to attacks upon our constituted Government institutions, I admit such treatment does subject the authorities to suspicion.

The gentleman will understand that both these boys to whom I refer took the examination held at my own college and passed. I made both recommendations upon a competitive examination.

Mr. BUTLER. I understand.

Mr. FESS. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is one question upon which I would like to have the attention of the House for a minute. There is a matter that has been presented to the educators of the country that I think the House ought to consider. I do not refer to the exact items discussed in the Senate yesterday, but to one other phase of similar character. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] referred a moment ago to the crowded curriculum of our schools. We establish grades for the high school. Then we set up certain standards for entrance to college. We require four years' work in the high school to make it of first grade. Then we fix a certain number of units—15, to be specific—in order to qualify for college entrance. A few years ago, by the munificence of Mr. Carnegie, there was organized in the country what is called the Carnegie Foundation. Among other things it has attempted is a standardization of colleges, in which it has published what it calls the standard requirement for college entrance, as well as the requirement of a college degree. Most of the colleges have adopted its recommendations. These requirements are not confined to scholarship, but extend to financial rating. I happen to have been at the head of an institution which, while it meets the requirements of both entrance and graduation, does not fall within the requirements of that foundation in all respects. The Carnegie Foundation fixes the requirements for a standard college, as I have just suggested, not alone upon educational qualifications but in addition upon a minimum number of professors who must not only be on the faculty but must confine their teaching in the college—that is, they must be free from teaching in the academy. In addition to that the size of the endowment that the college possesses is a third condition of standardization. A college, no matter what character of scholarship it represents, if it does not meet these two financial items—(1) number of teachers, (2) size of endowment—its rank will be unclassified.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the limit—

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been fixed by the committee itself.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the limit, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] may be permitted to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. FESS. I should like two minutes more.

Mr. PADGETT. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for two minutes. The gentleman says that will be sufficient.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. I thank the membership of the House, because I want to get this matter before the body. I repeat that this unofficial mentor names three elements that enter into the requirements to make up what is denominated a standard college. One is qualification in scholarship for entrance, which is equivalent to graduation from a first-grade high school of four years' work, and then graduation after four years in college. But, in addition to scholarship, there must be a certain number of salaried professors, and the Carnegie Foundation even suggests minimum salaries upon the ground that a small salary can not command the ability demanded by a standard college.

Mr. PADGETT. There is nothing of that kind which applies to the Naval Academy or to West Point.

Mr. FESS. No; nothing whatever. I have no reference to either Annapolis or West Point. I simply call the country's attention to a tendency in education.

Mr. PADGETT. I have had several young men enter Annapolis right from our high school.

Mr. FESS. Yes. Another qualification required by the Carnegie Foundation is that there must be an endowment, the minimum of which is fixed; and if the college does not come up to that financial standing, no matter what the character of work, it can not be regarded as a first-rank college, and its diploma amounts to nothing beyond that of an unclassified institution. While the Carnegie Foundation is not official, yet it is rapidly fixing our standards of education, since I may say, unfortunately, the colleges of the country have adopted its standard as their standard; and when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] suggested that a professional career demands four years in the high school, and then four years in a college, before one begins his special work for his profession. If you want to enter a law school, that means four years after the four years at college, or if you want to enter a medical school, it is four years after the four years in college. While I do not find fault with these rigid requirements, I do question the wisdom of specific tendencies. It means that some of the most worthy educational institutions in America that are builded, not on money but upon the sacrifices of men who are willing to teach at a smaller salary than that which is arbitrarily fixed, are absolutely excluded from the standard rank of colleges, and the diploma granted to a student will not mean anything, because the student carrying that diploma can not enter a first-grade medical school or first-grade law school that requires four years in a standard college as a prerequisite for entrance upon technical or special training. I believe in a standard, but it must not be a financial one, but educational. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the real purpose of this rating is to destroy the small college. There is a well-defined conviction that there are too many colleges in the country. This method of elimination has been adopted. The colleges of a State or section capable of meeting the financial requirements associate themselves as the college association, excluding all institutions which do not meet the standard.

The requirements of the professional schools, such as medicine and law, will limit entrance to those either matriculated in or graduates of one of the associated colleges. This discounts at once the diploma of any institution not included in the association, no matter how high the character of scholarship.

It consequently deals a deadly blow to the prosperity of the institution, since no ambitious student desires to attend an institution whose diploma is not a sure credential for any profession.

This brutalizing tendency in education which attempts to fix a money standard is both undemocratic and un-American. It substitutes a base standard for real scholarship. It augments the increasing expenses of education, and naturally crowds our institutions with heedless youth who are sent to college, and excludes the purposeful who would go to college were its standards other than the size of the pocketbook. It is this tendency that causes many a mother's heart to bleed when she learns that her son's chief college achievement is the modern college habits he knew nothing about until he learned them in his fraternity.

Whatever this country is to be, her citizens should avoid making her higher institutions a club or an association whose member's credentials are the size of his wallet.

Every tendency that would crush out the native talent by exclusion on a financial basis should be avoided, not only in an individual but in our institutional life. The small college doing a high-grade work, though its endowment does not reach a fixed

minimum, though its professors are not upon a professional salary basis, should not only be allowed to live but should be valued for what it is—the cradle of real scholarship to-day, as it has ever been in the past.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to have read in my time a telegram from a Rhode Island institution breathing patriotism.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be read in the gentleman's time.

The Clerk read as follows:

BOSTON, MASS., February 9, 1917.

Congressman GEORGE F. O'SHAUNESSY,
Washington, D. C.:

In case of need the facilities of our factory at Cranston, R. I., will be at the Government's service.

J. R. LEESON,
President Universal Winding Co.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, while I am on my feet and asking the indulgence of the committee, and hoping that my time will be extended just for a few minutes, I wish to sympathize with my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. EAGLE], who has had so much difficulty in the selection of young men for Annapolis and West Point. I think the discussion under this bill is very timely, for the reason that the selection of proper men for Annapolis and West Point lies at the foundation of our preparedness program. [Applause.] Although I confess to a very resolute adherence to civil-service ideas and principles, going so far yesterday as to uphold the President in his recommendation that postmasters in first, second, and third class offices be selected under civil-service rules—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended four minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has fixed the limit.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. They just indulged another Member, and I am asking the same privilege.

Mr. PADGETT. To show no preference, I will ask that the gentleman have four minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island be allowed to proceed for four minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I voted for the President's recommendation, believing that these men should come from the ranks of the employees, and that an outlet for ambition, energy, and efficiency should be given to the employees who have given their lives to that service. Still in choosing men for Annapolis and West Point I feel that I will have to differ from my own views on the civil service, so far as that branch of the governmental service is concerned. I believe it absolutely necessary that in appointing cadets or midshipmen we should have a personal interview with the men who are going to serve their Government in those capacities for the purpose of that test which only a face-to-face meeting can disclose. In my opinion you can not make a soldier out of a bookworm. A civil-service examination opening up these places to those who may be mentally qualified and perhaps physically so is not the supreme test.

I believe that the foundation of the application should be a vigorous, resolute, hardy manhood. [Applause.] First of all, a man, and, secondly, education. I want a man who, when he is called upon, will not think of books, but will think of his country; a man who, when he is called upon, will have no regard for sacrifice, but will be willing to stand any test, no matter how supreme, no matter how severe. It has been a pleasure to me to appoint young men to Annapolis and West Point after I have interviewed them myself, and when I have had a resolute, hearty handclasp from a fellow who looked me plumb in the eye, I have said, "By the eternal God, there is a man that will make a good soldier or a good sailor." [Applause.] Back of all qualifications there should be manhood, and I would respectfully commend my theory and my practice to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EAGLE]. And when I speak of men being physically qualified I do not refer to mere bulk, which must not be confounded with prowess. Deep down in the young man's heart must be a wholesome love of country and a willingness to serve. I trust that this subject will receive greater attention at the hands of Congress. I feel very much concerned when I hear of a man going to these institutions and failing after six months, after a rigorous examination to which they are subjected, and I fully believe that a thorough investigation at the time of their entrance by the Congressman who has the privilege of sending them there will remove a great many of these difficulties and add to the service of the Army and Navy of the United States. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Department of marine engineering and naval construction: One master machinist, \$1,900, and 1 assistant, \$1,400; 1 pattern maker, \$1,400; 1 boiler maker, 1 blacksmith, 3 machinists, 1 molder, and 1

coppersmith, at \$1,280 each; 1 pattern maker and 1 blacksmith, at \$1,080 each; 1 instructor in mechanical drawing, \$2,000; machinists and other employees, \$9,515.20; in all, \$27,335.20.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Some estimates were made a few moments ago as to the cost of maintenance of a cadet at Annapolis. I would like to have the chairman of the committee tell me the cost of maintenance of one enlisted man.

Mr. PADGETT. For an enlisted man in the Navy, I think the ration the past year was 39 cents.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not want the actual cost of maintaining the Navy, but the cost to the country of each enlisted man in the Navy.

Mr. PADGETT. I have not taken that matter up.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I assume that it would be at least the cost of one soldier in the Army.

Mr. PADGETT. I would think so.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It is estimated that one enlisted man costs at least \$1,200 a year. The chairman of the committee says that it costs about \$4,000 a year to maintain a cadet at Annapolis. Gentlemen raise their hands in holy horror at the tremendous waste of money in giving a young man an education so that he will be competent to command a battleship, and yet eventually he will command a thousand men whose cost of maintenance is \$1,200 a year each. Will any man on this floor say that a man educated at Annapolis competent to command a battleship is not worth at least four times what an enlisted man is?

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. SEARS. Does the gentleman think that the Government ought to pay that difference while he is obtaining that knowledge?

Mr. LONGWORTH. How could he eventually have the knowledge unless he obtains it at Annapolis? The value of an education at West Point or Annapolis can not be estimated in dollars and cents.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words in reference to this matter of Annapolis and West Point appointments. We have had a discussion on Annapolis and West Point examinations annually ever since I have been in Congress, and I desire to advocate again briefly the method I have used with some success; that is, the Rhodes scholarship method as nearly as it can be applied. I hold a competitive examination, or rather two examinations, a mental and physical examination, take the two sets of marks and add them together and then divide them by 2. Then take into consideration participation in school athletics, and the character and manhood of the boys the same as they do for the Rhodes scholarships. That is the only standard way to pick out an all-around boy that I know of. It requires a district, of course, in which you can get a number of candidates. It does not work very well if you have only two or three candidates, but if you can get a dozen candidates for examination, so that you can have some chance of getting an eligible list from your mental examination on the regular Annapolis or West Point requirements, conducted by the civil service—I think that is best, though some of my examinations have been conducted very well by local school authorities—and then have a physical examination on a competitive basis of the boys who stand highest the result is going to be that you will get a pretty good all-around boy. And I want to add that such a test usually appeals to the boys themselves and attracts more candidates than you can get for a competitive examination confined to the mental side.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I want to say that there was an examination held in my district several years ago of that kind, and the boy eventually graduated at the head of his class.

Mr. PLATT. I am glad to hear that, and I think it a natural outcome. Competitive examinations of course do not do everything, but they generally give you a boy that can pass the entrance examination at Annapolis, and with a fair chance of standing well afterwards.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the gentleman realize that there is something more, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY], and that is, is not the supreme test whether the boy has the metal besides necessary educational qualifications to render him eventually able to handle a battleship?

Mr. PLATT. Yes; and that is why we count the boy's physical examination and his record in athletics and his capacity for leadership.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mere physique does not determine whether a man has the metal to qualify him for leadership. I have seen a big bully who had plenty of physique who was a coward.

Mr. PLATT. The combination of mental capacity and physique ought to show the right qualification.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the gentleman whether, when a young man enters the Naval Academy, the whole test now is not book knowledge and his ability to pass the examination?

Mr. PLATT. No; there is a vast amount of physical training, and a good many boys break down under the physical training both at West Point and Annapolis. After the boy gets in he has to have the capacity to study, but the great trouble is that our grammar schools and high schools are not thorough. They do not ground the boys thoroughly in the things that they ought to be grounded in. Boys fail largely in the grammar-school subjects. I have had a boy pass an examination with almost 100 in algebra and geometry and fail in history, which he ought to have been able to read up on in two weeks so as to pass. The boy I have in mind did so well in mathematics in a competitive examination that I made him an alternate. I told him of his weakness in history, and suggested that he had plenty of time to read and master enough to pass the examination, but he could not do it. It was simply because he had not been trained to study and could not concentrate himself. He could not do what every boy who has had a good high-school education ought to be able to do.

Mr. McCracken. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. McCracken. Does not the gentleman feel that he is reflecting on the teachers of the high schools in the country when he says that the boys have not been trained to study?

Mr. PLATT. I am reflecting on the high schools and the private schools, too. I have had boys from both kinds of schools, and they have not been trained thoroughly in either. The idea of the usual school is to pass as many boys and girls as possible to higher grades, so as to give the school a good statistical record. That is the way the schools work all over this country. They are rarely thorough.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that debate upon the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I object. I have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has not the floor. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SABATH. But I moved to strike out the last two words before the gentleman secured the floor, and the Chair recognized me.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman whether two minutes would satisfy him.

Mr. SABATH. I replied that I would not use more than two or three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee prefers a request for unanimous consent that all debate close—

Mr. PADGETT. In three minutes; that the gentleman from Illinois have two minutes and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] have one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. That debate close in three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition for the purpose of asking a question of the chairman of the committee. The statement has been made by some gentleman upon the floor this afternoon that the sons of officers, as a rule, succeed in passing the examinations before boys who have been appointed who are not relatives of officers. I myself have suspected that, because whenever I appoint the son of an officer he always passes, but whenever I appoint some one else who is not connected with the military or naval service he has his own troubles. For that reason I would like to ask the chairman if he could give the House information as to the percentage of boys who are now in the Naval Academy who are the sons or relatives of officers?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I can not; and I can not give the gentleman that information, because what I have heard here this evening is about all I have ever heard upon this subject. I want to say to the gentleman that perhaps it might be accounted for by this fact: If an officer has a son in the academy and that officer is there at the academy, he would have

the boy in his home and would be likely to give him instructions. I do not know, though, that there is any foundation for these rumors. I have had young men enter the academy from the high schools without preparation and I have had other young men who took special preparation who failed. I have never seen any evidences of favoritism. They have treated me just as they have others. When my boy failed they kept him out, just as they have kept others out.

Mr. SABATH. Then it is the opinion of the gentleman that these examinations are honestly conducted and without any preference being given?

Mr. PADGETT. As far as I know, they are absolutely square and honest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I wish to have read in my time a telegram from Dr. J. H. Kellogg, one of the foremost scientists of the country and the head of a very great sanitarium, which telegram I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the telegram, as follows:

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., February 5, 1917.

Hon. J. M. C. SMITH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

America ought to set an example to the whole world by finding means for settling the controversy with Germany without war. The war will ultimately be settled by economic rather than military forces. America is big enough to be patient and pioneer the way to better things.

J. H. KELLOGG.

The Clerk read as follows:

Commissary department: One chief cook, \$1,200; 8 cooks, at \$600 each, and 12 assistants, at \$360 each; 1 steward, \$1,200, and 1 assistant, \$1,080; 1 head waiter, \$840, and 3 assistants, at \$600 each; 4 pantrymen, at \$420 each; 1 chief baker, at \$1,200; 5 bakers, \$600 each; 2 assistants, at \$540 each, and 3 assistants, \$480; 1 head butcher, at \$900; 2 assistant butchers, at \$720 each, and 1 butcher's helper, at \$480; 4 baker helpers, at \$300 each; 65 waiters, at \$20 per month each, and 65 waiters, at \$16 per month each, \$29,280; 4 coffee-men, at \$300 each; 4 dish pantrymen, at \$300 each, 4 firemen, at \$300 each; 4 utility men, at \$300 each; 2 linemen, at \$300 each; 2 seamstresses, at \$420 each; 4 clerks, at \$360 each; in all, \$64,620.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I have some amendments which I desire to offer for the purpose of making some clerical corrections.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, line 18, strike out the figures "\$29,280" and insert the figures "\$28,080"; page 46, line 22, strike out the figures "\$64,620" and insert "\$63,420"; and page 46, line 26, strike out the figures "\$381,173.20" and insert "\$379,973.20."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inform the gentleman that the paragraph to which the last amendment is offered has not yet been read.

Mr. PADGETT. That is correct. I will ask for a vote upon the other two amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the gentleman from Tennessee to the paragraph ending on line 22, page 46.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a question, not in the way of criticism but for information. Is there any regulation or rule or law which pertains to men in the active service of the Navy who engage or associate themselves with others who are engaged in commercial enterprises for profit?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. There is a statute which was passed some years ago that prohibits retired officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, though not of the Army, from engaging in certain occupations and businesses in civil life that sell material to the Government.

Mr. HICKS. The question I have is with reference to an officer upon the active service.

Mr. PADGETT. A man upon the active service can not engage at all.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, this situation has been brought to my attention. I do not want to mention the name of any officer because it is possible that there are others who are in the same position, and it is possible that neither he nor they are violating any regulations. I know of an officer in the active service of the Navy who has lent his name to an invention he has made to a commercial enterprise. This commercial enterprise advertises the fact that he is a captain in the United States Navy, and that if the persons who are buying supplies desire special information this captain will supply it.

The question arose in my mind as to whether that was fair to the Government who is paying the man for his full service or fair to the competitor of that commercial concern, because the competitors do not have the same advantage in having a

United States naval man at their head or as a consulting expert. It may be that it is best for the Government to allow this dual service so that the incentive for profit may stimulate the officers to perfect inventions from which the Government as well as private concerns will profit. Personally I question the expediency of such a practice.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know what the invention is and do not know about it, but the law prohibits a retired officer and I also understand active officers from engaging in business in that way.

Mr. HICKS. I took this up with the Navy Department and I could not get any definite information, but I did get this much, that they do not find any law which prohibits an officer in the active service of the Navy from lending his name to or associating himself with a private commercial enterprise.

Mr. BUTLER. It may be done, but it is against the will of the department, and it is certainly against the intention of Congress and I would be in favor of taking him off the active list if he does it.

Mr. PADGETT. He may have some patent and the concern uses his patent or invention.

Mr. HICKS. They do use his name in advertising it.

Mr. TALBOTT. Is it such an invention as the Government uses?

Mr. HICKS. No; it is used by small boat manufacturers.

Mr. TALBOTT. The gentleman knows the law is that any invention that an officer makes, either of the Army or the Navy, or anyone in the Government service, belongs to the Government?

Mr. HICKS. Yes.

Mr. TALBOTT. But if it is an invention that is something that is not used by the Government, while it is not good taste, I do not think there is any law in reference to it.

Mr. HICKS. The gentleman does not think there is any law to prevent it?

Mr. TALBOTT. No; but it may not be good taste.

Mr. HICKS. Should not there be such a law?

Mr. TALBOTT. I will take that up later on.

Mr. BUTLER. Has the gentleman presented the case to the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. HICKS. Yes; to the Judge Advocate General of the Navy.

Mr. BUTLER. And the Secretary has made the reply that there was no law to prevent it?

Mr. HICKS. The Judge Advocate did not state it very clearly. He said that so far as he knew there was no law to prevent it.

Mr. BUTLER. Well, I will make it my business to look into the matter and see if we can not have a law.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Chairman, I have the honor to represent a district filled with peace-loving, loyal, patriotic people. Practically all of them are opposed to war, but if war comes, whether our Nation is right or wrong, they will all support the Government with all their power. Having in mind possibilities, the loyal and patriotic citizens of the village of Aitkin, far north in the district, comes to the front with a telegram promising aid, which telegram I will insert as a part of my remarks.

The people of Aitkin have not taken this step to encourage war, but to stand back of the Nation in everything that may be necessary. In that district, at least, everybody knows that the war conditions are the result of the uneconomic law that governs trade and commerce—the privilege that has been given to a few in this world to make industrial slaves of the rest of us. With one proper act of Congress the world could be changed—conquered by the force of the collective demand of all mankind—when the way is pointed out that would make it sure that the industrious and intelligent in all the fields of useful work can command success for themselves by their industry instead of having it serve to make a few of the specially favored successful. That would result in a peace-loving people everywhere. Let one nation act wisely—really wisely—the rest will be forced to follow with even more speed than the unwise acts have been followed by one nation after another. There need be no war to establish and enforce our rights on the high seas. If we adopt the economic law for our own Government we shall conquer the world, not by drenching it in blood, not by vain glory that will be looked upon by succeeding generations as the last colossal act of American barbarism if it should come—no, not in the blood of the brave will we conquer insanity, but we can do so in the common sense of a new nation-wide intelligence applied to an adjustment of business to meet the needs and demands of the people generally instead of as now to satisfy the speculators and make them lord of all our actions, even to the extent of forcing us into war.

The telegram is as follows:

Hon. C. A. LINDBERGH,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Place at disposal of the War Department Red River Lumber Co.'s sawmill plant, consisting of five factory buildings, over 2,000-horsepower engines, and equipment located on ideal site with ample trackage and yards. Plant now idle. Ready for Government's immediate use.

AITKIN COMMERCIAL CLUB,
ED McCONVILLE,
Chairman Committee.

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In reference to the discussion had a few moments ago in regard to the fact that some midshipmen were dismissed on account of failure, my belief is that the age limit for admission is too low. My recollection is one can not be admitted over 20 years of age, and I think that is a great mistake. Most of the applicants who go to the Naval Academy go from high schools, and at 20 years of age they have not got the education or the maturity to enable them to stand the course that they have to take at the academy. I recommended applicants by a competitive examination before they went before the board, but a number of them failed, and I think it would be wiser to raise the limit of age from 20 to 22 years, and I think the chairman, if he would think over the matter, will do that.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, in reference to that I want to say that the naval officers for several years have appeared before the committee urging that the age be reduced from 16 to 20 to 15 to 18 and Members of Congress have come to me personally insisting that the best age that we could get them was just as young as possible, and the committee has refrained from taking either one of those. In England, I understand, they take them at 12 years of age instead of 16, as we do here. So that we are standing on the 16 to 20, and you ask here the higher age, and the department is wanting it put at from 15 to 18. The English have them admitted at 12 years of age.

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. I think in England they get a longer course or else the course is not so hard as in the United States Naval Academy, because they could not possibly stand a course here at 12 years of age. Very few can stand it at 20 years, and last year—I am not sure whether it was the Naval Academy or the Military Academy—80 persons in the academy were dismissed because of failing to pass the examinations. They have not the maturity of age to enable them to stand the course.

Mr. PADGETT. It is not the age question, but if the gentleman will go down to the academy he will find it is the boy does not apply himself.

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. Oh, no.

Mr. PADGETT. The great bulk of them, the younger boys themselves who enter at 16 years, a larger per cent of them graduate than those who enter at 20 years of age.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. FESS. If the pupil in the high school will be regular he will finish his fourth year and will graduate from the high school at 18, and that gives him two years leeway after finishing in the best high schools in the country, so I rather agree with the chairman that the age limit is not too low.

Mr. PADGETT. No; the age limit is very satisfactory.

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. It simply gives the boys who have parents who have the means to send them to advanced schools an advantage over the boy the son of parents of moderate means, and I am opposed to it. Our rural high schools are becoming more efficient year by year, and I am in favor of giving the graduate of the rural high schools an equal chance with the city boy.

The Clerk read as follows:

Department of Buildings and Grounds: 1 messenger to superintendent, \$600; 45 building attendants, at \$400 each, \$18,000; in all, \$18,600.

In all, civil establishment, \$381,173.20.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, line 26, amend by striking out "\$381,173.20" and insert "\$379,973.20."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I fear my original statement may be misunderstood. In that I gave you the expenditures for "Pay of professors and others at the Naval Academy." I now give you the total of the expenditures at the academy for this year, which is \$824,729.20, as compared with \$703,946.92 for last year. I desire also to call the committee's attention to the fact

that on page 30 of the present bill under the head of "Bureau of Medicine and Surgery," in which is included the Naval Academy, together with other places, there is an appropriation in the sum of \$1,121,740 for medical supplies, and so forth. I also find under the heading "Contingent, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery," on pages 30 and 31, in which is included the Naval Academy together with other places, an appropriation of \$291,080 for purchase of one motor-propelled vehicle for official use only, and so forth, and for naval medical supply depots, sick quarters at Naval Academy, and so forth. I do not know how much of the above amounts go to the Naval Academy.

My colleague from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] stated that because a soldier in line received \$1,200 it was unjust to criticize a boy who received for his services in the shape of education and supplies and maintenance, \$4,000. I think the comparison is hardly fair, because the boy at college is securing for himself an education and is preparing himself for a life position at a salary commensurate with the services he is to render, while the poor fellow in line, who is willing to die for his country, can never hope to get more than the \$1,200, and has no educational advantages.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS. I will.

Mr. PADGETT. A great proportion of that \$4,000 that the gentleman refers to is the interest, the maintenance, and overhead charges in keeping up the plant there. We have \$14,000,000 invested in that plant, and in making up that we count the interest on that, the repairs to building, and the salaries of officers, and all that.

Mr. SEARS. If this Government of ours, when it can borrow money at 2 per cent, is paying this enormous amount because of the interest, something should be done to stop it, and we can not do it by increasing these appropriations.

I have no complaint to make about the young men I have sent to Annapolis. They have been true to the trust I have imposed in them and they are making good. Along that line I have no complaint. Nor would I object to the payment of any salary to any professor commensurate with the services he returns, but the House seems to have gotten away from the original point.

Mr. SNYDER. A moment ago you stated that the enlisted man was ready to die for his country. Do you expect that the young man you appointed to West Point would not be ready to die for his country?

Mr. SEARS. I certainly would expect him to die for his country if the same became necessary. The point I make is that you are paying the young man in the Army \$1,200 per year for life for his services and it is costing the taxpayers about \$4,500 per year to educate a boy at Annapolis. I do not believe it should cost so much. However, we have gotten away from the original proposition under discussion. I trust what I have said will not be taken in a spirit of criticism, and I have brought the various matters mentioned in my remarks to the attention of the House in order that we might discuss them and that we might discover really what is being done. I can not hope for results this year, and I have taken up the time of the House solely with the hope that some reforms may be accomplished. The question under discussion was not how a young man should get into the academy or how he should get out of the academy, but I contended then and I contend now, Mr. Chairman, that because of omission or neglect on our part or through oversight the Naval Academy at Annapolis is costing the people of this country more in proportion per man, 1,200 students, than any other college in the United States; and as one of the Representatives of the people I felt it was my duty to bring it to your attention and let you deal with the matter as you saw fit.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in order that I may save time by not again addressing the committee on the question, I want at this time to say that in the paragraph just read about 62 additional men will be employed next year. I do not know whether they will be employed after the quota is increased to 1,700 or whether they will be employed under the quota of 1,200.

Mr. PADGETT. I will say to the gentleman that the estimate for next year is that there will not be less than 1,500, an increase of 300, at least, over the present number in the academy.

Mr. SEARS. Well, then, with that increase they certainly ought to have butchers, chief butchers, assistant butchers, and so forth. But, Mr. Chairman, that was not really the point I was objecting to. As I said, I believe it is costing too much, and something should be done to correct it. I certainly believe retired naval officers should be used, as far as possible, as instructors at the academy, and I can not bring myself to believe they would object to such service.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DAVIS] to have 5 minutes, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] 5 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, 5 minutes to be occupied by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DAVIS], 5 minutes by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER], and 5 minutes by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD]. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, just before the gentlemen begin I would like to make a request. A great many gentlemen are asking that we expedite this bill. I am trying to do so. At the same time I, too, do not want to seem unfair. I will ask the membership of the House to please cooperate with me, if they can, and let us cut out some of this debate.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have been mum during the discussion of this measure until the present. I am not in favor of going wild over a great system of Army and Navy expenditures in line of preparedness. But I am in favor of having a most efficient and competent set of men educated to direct our military and naval forces; and the education is technical and expert, special, and should be thorough. And I am one of those that believe a fine investment is made even if you double the cost of the ordinary college in turning out from our war colleges a man who is able to take charge of a division of the Army in any part of the battle line that we may have anywhere on earth. I am one of those who believe that the money is well expended that will make not only a good fighter in our Navy, but a man who can understand the hydrography of the earth wherever his ship may be and be ready to direct his forces safely and accurately anywhere, and make a seadog, so to speak, of the boy, prepared to live a life of active service in the defense of his country anywhere his ship may be. And I am not bothered about the special extra cost. I want the knowledge complete and thorough. I would be glad to leave off a few great ships and have the remainder in charge of thorough and competent men. [Applause.]

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] is recognized.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to what I consider to be a grave defect in this bill. The bill as originally drawn provides for hundreds and millions of dollars for ships and ammunition. We have had amendments brought in here because of the emergency that will add millions more. But there is no provision in this bill and there is no emergency amendment offered to provide for an increase in the personnel of the Navy. To my mind that is the gravest defect now existing in the Navy. It is the gravest defect now existing in this bill.

We have a deficiency already in the personnel of the Navy in the enlisted men of more than 20,000. We can not send out our commissioned ships. Of what avail will it be to us to expend additional hundreds of millions of dollars for more ships and more ammunition and more material if we do not do something to increase the personnel of the Navy? Gentlemen say here that they are making earnest endeavor to recruit the Navy, but they also say that they can not, under existing conditions, recruit the Navy even to fill the ships now in commission. Then we must do something in order to accomplish this result. We can expend hundreds of millions of dollars for more ships, but we are unable to spend a few thousand dollars to increase the pay of the men in the Navy in order to secure the necessary enlistment. I want to read from the hearings when the Secretary of the Navy was before the committee. Mr. KELLEY asked:

I wondered if you had worked out any plan whereby we might hope to get men faster than we have been getting them during the past six months.

The answer of the Secretary was:

Yes; we have worked out plans. We have increased the number of recruiting stations. I am asking for an appropriation of \$50,000 for automobiles for the use of recruiting officials to be sent into the country districts.

Fifty thousand dollars for automobiles, but not one cent of increase in pay for the men who are to be enlisted in this service! [Applause.] And he goes on and says—

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I regret I can not.

Mr. BAILEY. Just for a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes; but I suggest to the gentleman to make it very short.

Mr. BAILEY. Is it not true that the pay of the men in the Navy to-day is greater, all things considered, than that of the ordinary workman?

Mr. TOWNER. Oh, no; but I have not the time to discuss it. But, whatever it is, what futility is it for us to build ships and pay hundreds of millions of dollars for them and make no provision for manning them? We ought not to build the ships unless we are willing to pay what is necessary to get the men to man the ships, and it makes no difference what the amount required is our ships will be useless unless we have the men to man them. Comparatively, the pay of the men in the Navy is but a small item in the large amounts that are provided for here.

Mr. KELLEY said further to the Secretary:

This is rather an emergency time—I think everybody recognizes that—in the history of the world. Do you not think we ought to get the men now?

The Secretary said:

Certainly; we ought to get the men.

And Mr. KELLEY asked:

And take all the measures necessary?

And the Secretary said:

We have already taken the steps necessary to increase recruiting, and we are already getting results.

It is fair to say that the Secretary agreed to the proposition that the pay of the men ought to be increased if we desire to get more recruits for the Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he starts in?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. Yesterday the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] proposed an amendment to increase the pay of the sailors.

Mr. TOWNER. Yes; and it should have been adopted. I confess, Mr. Chairman, that I do not know what ought to be done, what inducements ought to be offered, whether it should be in the term of service or in some other form. But I do know, and I think every Member of this House knows, that we must do something in order to man the ships that are to compose our Navy.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes; certainly; I will be glad to yield to the chairman.

Mr. PADGETT. In the last session of Congress we authorized the increase of the enlisted personnel from 51,500 to a possible limit of more than 88,000. We provided a reorganization of the personnel, and we have stated time and time again that we have given them greater advantages. We have provided for many benefits to them that they did not have before. We shortened the term of enlistment, and put it down either in that bill or in the one just before, allowing one year's enlistment. It was in that bill, I believe. You could get as low as one year's enlistment, and then allow them to extend if they wanted to.

Now, all of that was provided in August last, looking after the personnel, and as soon as that begins to spread out and get into communication with the public, and they are knowing it, we are getting increased enlistments; and I think the thing to do is to try out in a reasonable way what we did on the 29th of August last, less than six months ago.

Mr. TOWNER. I will ask the chairman of the committee why he did not act on the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy and increase the pay of these men?

Mr. PADGETT. Simply because we did not think it was necessary, in view of what we had done in the bill of August 29, 1916, less than six months before.

Mr. TOWNER. Now you have a deficiency of 20,000 men to man the ships now in commission, and you are not doing one single thing in this emergency to secure the men, and yet you are asking for millions of dollars to procure additional ships and ammunition.

Mr. PADGETT. Because we think we had done what was adequate only a few months before in the bill of August 29, 1916.

Mr. TOWNER. But we did not have the emergency then that we have now. You are offering amendment after amendment now to prepare for emergencies. Why not offer amendments to meet this emergency?

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa yield me a moment to ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GARDNER. May I ask it in the gentleman's time?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman from Tennessee says that when we passed the law last year the enlisted men of the Navy were 51,500.

Mr. PADGETT. No; I said that was the authorized enlistment.

Mr. GARDNER. They were enlisted up to that amount?

Mr. PADGETT. They were a little over, and we had a provision enacted legalizing the three or four hundred enlistments over that number that had taken place.

Mr. GARDNER. And now on the 1st of February I find the number is up to 53,456.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. As against 52,000 in August, in spite of all your inducements.

Mr. PADGETT. And during the month of January we added a net gain of 1,344.

Mr. GARDNER. Yes. And is not January always the chief enlistment month of the year?

Mr. PADGETT. Not always. It is one of the good months.

Mr. GARDNER. That is when the snowbirds all come in.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to use the rest of my time. I hope that even in this bill the committee will do something to increase the pay of the enlisted men. At least that ought to be tried in this emergency. I find on page 794 of the hearings that Lieut. Commander McCandless says that the base pay of seamen of the first class is \$35 down, with \$24 a month; of second class, \$30 down, with \$19; of seamen of the third class, \$22 down, with \$16 a month; that for messmen it is \$60 down, with \$16 a month. In other words, for the class of seamen that we most need the pay is now \$16 a month. It occurs to me, gentlemen, that it would be not only wise but a frugal policy as well, an economical policy as well, if we should raise the pay of these seamen to at least decent wages in order that we may secure them in numbers sufficient to fill the Navy. Sixteen dollars a month will not tempt many desirable young men to join the Navy, even in times of emergency; and we should have them now. It takes a year to train a recruit how to handle a gun on board ship. What folly it will be to be compelled, in case of emergency, to tie our battleships to our wharves until we can train men to handle them; \$16 a month is too small a wage to secure men in such times as these.

Mr. PADGETT. The figures that the gentleman read were the base pay that was provided by statute years ago. There was a subsequent statute that added 10 per cent to that, so you should add 10 per cent to those figures.

Mr. TOWNER. One dollar and sixty cents a month?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Current and miscellaneous expenses, Naval Academy: Text and reference books for use of instructors; stationery, blank books and forms, models, maps, and periodicals; apparatus and materials for instruction in physical training and athletics; expenses of lectures and entertainments not exceeding \$1,000, including pay and expenses of lecturer; chemicals, philosophical apparatus and instruments, stores, machinery, tools, fittings, apparatus, and materials for instruction purposes, \$41,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I rise to obtain some information as to the policy pursued by the committee in increasing the salaries of the personnel at the Naval Academy. In the prior paragraphs there has been quite a general increase of salaries, in some instances ranging as high as \$300, most of them only a reasonable increase of \$100. Did the committee have any general policy in making these increases?

Mr. PADGETT. No horizontal increase or anything of that kind. We took up each case and dealt with it with reference to the character of men required, the character of the service to be performed, the duties of the office, and the general standard of requirements.

Mr. STAFFORD. In all these instances were these increases recommended by the department?

Mr. PADGETT. They were recommended by the management of the academy and approved by the department.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are there any instances where the committee declined to follow the recommendation of the department for increases?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not recall any.

Mr. STAFFORD. So the committee virtually adopted the recommendation of the department in every instance?

Mr. PADGETT. Virtually. I believe where the department had recommended an odd figure we may have made it an even figure.

Mr. STAFFORD. The committee, following the recommendation of the department, did not go very far into each case, as to whether it was based on merit or not.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; we did.

Mr. STAFFORD. I assume they took the word of the department, and followed it without much further investigation.

Mr. PADGETT. We had some of the officers of the Naval Academy before the committee—the superintendent and some of the other officers—and we inquired of them as to the character of the service to be performed, and so forth.

Mr. STAFFORD. Was there any instance where the committee declined to follow the recommendation of the department so far as increases of salary are concerned?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not recall any.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was the policy of the committee to accept the recommendations of the department so far as increases were concerned.

Mr. PADGETT. If we approved it at all. We may not have given some that the department recommended, but where we gave them we usually followed the recommendation of the department.

Mr. STAFFORD. The committee is rather acquiescent, in so far as increases of salary are concerned.

Mr. PADGETT. In the Naval Academy, and in the reorganization under the bill of last year, the whole thing is under reorganization, and we followed the recommendations of the department where they accorded with the administration of the academy.

Mr. STAFFORD. I may be in error, but I do not recall any instance where the committee has made such general increases in salaries as in the personnel of the Naval Academy.

Mr. PADGETT. No; we have not for years, because the bill of last August authorized a complete reorganization. Last year we gave the Secretary a lump-sum appropriation, \$175,000, and this year it is being apportioned.

Mr. STAFFORD. For these specially enumerated officials who are carried in this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. Professors and instructors, and so forth.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the discretion granted to the Secretary what is the pay as finally fixed compared to the pay in other educational institutions?

Mr. PADGETT. He has not consummated his arrangements yet, and we have not got his report. The thing is undergoing reorganization now. He got his authority on the 29th of August and the school year began in September, and he has not had time to put into effect the reorganization. It is being worked out in the department.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand, in some instances naval officers who have been engaged in professorial work have been discontinued and civilian professors substituted in their stead?

Mr. PADGETT. That is contemplated as to some of them. Whether it has actually been done or not in the present session I am not prepared to say, because there had to be a very large increase in the number of professors and instructors in the aggregate, and they have been trying to get them, but there are certain matters, for instance, foreign languages and literature and things of that kind—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. With the information that the gentleman has gleaned after many years of service on the committee, can he inform the House whether there have been any instances where teachers in the Naval Academy have left to go to other institutions because of a difference in compensation between that of the academy and the private institutions?

Mr. PADGETT. Teachers at the Naval Academy have insisted very strongly that they were underpaid. A few years ago it was recommended by the prior Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Meyer, that the civilian instructors be dispensed with altogether and that their places be supplemented with naval officers. We never had such a propaganda come to the committee as we had then, with the insistence that they should be let alone. They had the presidents of the various universities send us letters—I remember receiving several of them—urging the importance and insisting on having civilian instructors remain in the academy. They showed a very great anxiety and an intense interest to remain in the academy, notwithstanding

prior to that time they had been urging that they were underpaid.

Mr. STAFFORD. They manifested as great an interest as public officials do to retain office?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. They liked their berths very well?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. But there have been no instances of leaving the Naval Academy because of disparagement in pay?

Mr. PADGETT. There may have been individual instances, but there has been no hegira.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Does not the gentleman think that in case of war or an emergency we could get all the volunteers for the Navy we needed?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I think so, with the authorization we have had and the 10,000 from the naval service and the reserve we are building up in a satisfactory way, and from the 30,000 or 35,000 ex-enlisted men who are in civil life.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Is it not a fact that the young men do not enlist now in great numbers because they do not like to be perpetual soldiers?

Mr. PADGETT. The Navy has been having satisfactory enlistments until the abnormal conditions arose in manufacturing, and even now, since we amended the act last August giving additional advantages and preferences, it is coming up again. A year ago we had a waiting list for enlistments in the Navy.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, Naval Academy, exclusive of public works, \$824,729.20.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to correct a total.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clerical error; page 48, line 20, strike out the figures "\$824,729.20" and insert "\$833,529.20."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In the present bill a great many increases in salaries have been made. I have no objection to these increases, because I like to be consistent. As I have stated several times, I believe in paying a man what he is worth. I have always made that fight, even when I asked for an increase in salary for myself. I voted for the District increase. I voted for the 5 and 10 per cent increase every time it came before the House. The House let all the others go through, and this has gone through, and meets with my approval.

But I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that when it came to the Post Office bill which related to the boys back home receiving less than \$1,000 and less than \$1,800 a year we were unable to secure for them any increase. I want to be absolutely frank, and state that I voted for the other increases because I believed they were entitled to it, and because I thought those back home would receive the increase they were also entitled to. The high cost of living at home is just as much as the high cost of living in Washington, if the amounts which I have to pay for supplies are any criterion to go by. I hope the House will see its way clear to allow the postal employees throughout the country receiving less than \$1,000 a year the same increase in their salaries as allowed other employees, in order that they may meet the present high cost of living.

I want to say in this connection that if more talk had been indulged in in an effort to reduce the high cost of living rather than indulging in talk to secure raises in salaries there would have been better results throughout the country. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

MARINE CORPS.

Pay, Marine Corps: Pay of officers, active and reserve list: For pay and allowances prescribed by law for all officers on the active and reserve list, including clerks for assistant paymasters, nine, \$1,690.666.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I believe this item carries the pay of all the officers in the Marine Corps.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; except on the retired list.

Mr. MANN. All on the active and reserve list.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. How are the officers in the Marine Corps appointed in the first instance?

Mr. PADGETT. By passing the examination, and under the law the Secretary of the Navy may assign cadets from the Naval Academy or from the Military Academy. Then they are taken from civil life, and those in civil life must pass an examination. If they pass satisfactorily, they are nominated

by the President and confirmed by the Senate. They are appointed for a probationary period of two years before the commission becomes permanent.

Mr. MANN. How do they become eligible for examination?

Mr. PADGETT. The Secretary has advertised generally and anybody that makes application can take the examination.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, one of the most remarkable things I have ever seen or heard of in connection with such matters, under the gentleman's statement, is the list of officers or citizens named for a probationary period of two years by the President of the United States. On January 10 last, the President sent in the nomination of 10 citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps for the probationary period of two years. Among those names I find the following:

Louis W. Whaley, of South Carolina.

John M. Arthur, of South Carolina.

James F. Jeffords, of South Carolina.

Thomas P. Cheatham, of South Carolina.

William C. James, of South Carolina.

Of course, they make only 5 out of the 10. It may be that they are more enterprising in seeking these advertised-for examinations—

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Not yet. I would like to use a little of my own time first.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. No. I will give the gentlemen information, if they do not have it; and if they do have it, let them keep quiet until I get through.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, on February 6 the President sent in the names of 22 citizens for the same position of second lieutenants for a probationary period. Among those names I find the following:

Charles P. Gilchrist, of South Carolina.

Karl I. Buse, of South Carolina.

John R. Martin, of South Carolina.

Samuel A. Woods, jr., of South Carolina.

David H. Owen, of South Carolina.

James K. Bolton, of South Carolina.

James T. Moore, of South Carolina.

William C. Byrd, of South Carolina.

George B. Reynolds, of South Carolina.

There were altogether 32 names in the two lists. Thirteen of those come from South Carolina and 6 from Virginia. Three come from all of the Northern States. Of course, I am assuming that it is because the citizens of South Carolina are either more enterprising in answering these advertisements or else they are more capable in passing the examinations.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit?

Mr. MANN. It is such a peculiar circumstance that I think it is perfectly proper to call attention to it. Of course when I see the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE] now standing in the center aisle just in front of me, I can understand how they can pass a better examination than the citizens from any place else in this country.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes; for an explanation or an apology, either one.

Mr. PADGETT. I should have stated that under the provisions of the law the graduates of military schools of a certain type and character are entitled to and are considered for the appointment, and upon inquiry I was told that most of those, or many of them, were graduates of these schools.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, there is no such law; and, in the second place, it is ridiculous for any gentleman, either by way of explanation or apology, to say that when you come to take the schools of the country, South Carolina, as to a competitive examination, would have a percentage of 13 out of 32.

Mr. PADGETT. Under the law the Secretary made regulations recognizing certain schools.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; he makes regulations that take care of South Carolina.

Mr. PADGETT. But all of these men were not graduates of South Carolina schools. They were graduates of schools of other States of the Union.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is seeking now to convey to the House the impression that if you scatter South Carolina students all over the country, no one else has an even chance to compete with them; that they can not come up to them. Mr. Chairman, I admit that South Carolina is a great State and that its people are the smartest in the United States, if not in the whole world. I make that admission, and will not require

proof from any of the gentlemen from South Carolina; and yet it hardly seems quite the proper method of selecting officers for the Marine Corps or any other branch of the Government service to fix it so that South Carolina and Virginia, between them, get 19 appointments out of 32.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is so obsessed with the idea that South Carolina is going to get something that even in the case of filling these appointments, where the men have accepted commissions and have gone to the front in Santo Domingo, where they are now doing duty as marines, he can not even stop chiding my State for sending these men to the front. South Carolina may not be as large a State as Illinois, but if you will go to the border, where the soldiers are on duty, you will find that the number and the service of those from South Carolina will compare very favorably with the soldiers from the State of Illinois. I want to say to the gentleman respecting the appointments, in so far as the Citadel is concerned, that men from the North recognize it as one of the honor schools of this Government, one of the honor military schools of the country, and when I learned that these appointments were to be made under regulations I wrote to the commandant of that school and asked him to give me the names of all of the graduates who were permitted to compete for it. I wrote a number of letters, and the commandant wrote them letters, and it is because of that fact that they came here under the regulations and stood the examination. If, forsooth, there are more men from that small State of South Carolina than from the State of Illinois in this trying hour of our country's need who apply to go to the front to fight her battles and protect her flag, it seems to me, if I were the gentleman representing that State, I would not want to call attention to it. The positions they have sought, and to which they have been appointed, are not sinecures. They are not swivel-chair positions, not places where they can hang around Washington and wear parade uniforms, but these men have had to go and serve where neither the gentleman nor myself have ever served, in places of danger, to protect the flag, and they have to go wherever the Marine Corps is ordered to go. But surely, when these young men are willing to devote their lives to their country's needs and go out and give this service, it ill becomes so great a man as the gentleman from Illinois to stand on this floor and chide this Government for accepting their services, or my little State for offering them, in this hour of the country's need.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I sometimes have regretted that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE] himself had not been admitted to the Marine Corps, so that he would not be a Member of the House.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I am quite sure the gentleman would like to lose just a few more from the Democratic side, because he will be badly in need of them before he is Speaker.

Mr. MANN. We have got enough.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to be satisfied about this. I am not crediting citizens of one State with having more patriotism than those of another, but it will be interesting to me to know how all these young men from these two States reached the Marine Corps. I understood the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs to say it was by reason of some naval regulation. If these young men from these two States, after taking a competent examination, had gotten a better average than the young men from other States, I have not any criticism, but if the school from which they were graduated was selected as one from which its graduates were not required to take an examination, then I do take the exception, and ask the chairman to answer the question and put the inquiry at rest. There is a great deal of criticism and unfavorable comment upon the large proportion of appointments from these two States of the Union. Nineteen out of thirty-two appointments to the Marine Corps have been selected—

Mr. PADGETT. I understand that the Secretary has a list of schools in a number of States, and has placed them upon the same basis, and he takes the graduates from any and all of these schools and puts them on the same basis, where they have a certificate of graduation from that school of a certain standard; and if they pass that examination, and then they have their physical examination, they are entitled to be nominated. That applies to any school in any State that has the requirements of the standard prescribed for this character of military training.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman know the character of the schools? Can he tell us one of these schools?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not. I do not know where the schools are. I do not know where the schools are located; I do not know where these men graduate. I just understood that they were graduates of a military school that was on the list which

met the standards or requirement or recognition, just as West Point has a list of a number of schools over the country where they accept their certificate in lieu of the examination that is required.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, of course the Secretary of the Navy will be pleased to give us this regulation, but I do know of a number of young men from the State of Pennsylvania who have been studying here one year and were compelled to take a hard competitive examination before they received a commission in the Marine Corps.

Mr. PADGETT. I know of a number from Tennessee who did so; some passed and some failed.

Mr. BUTLER. It is open to criticism and it is open to unfavorable comment that 19 young men out of two States of the Union should be selected to fill 32 places and without examination and without competition.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I do not just this minute recall, but will the gentleman tell me the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs in another body?

Mr. BUTLER. I can not at this minute recall. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield for an interruption?

Mr. BUTLER. I am told that we are required to say "in another body" instead of "the Senate of the United States."

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman from Tennessee points out the fact that young men are admitted to the academy at West Point without examination, an academy where they are to be taught and from which they must graduate before they become second lieutenants. Is not that very different from admitting young men as second lieutenants direct without examination?

Mr. PADGETT. If they meet the standard which is involved in the examination to be held at that time, and if they do accept the standard, that is equivalent to the requirements of their examination.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a minute or two.

Mr. PADGETT. And I want to say it is a probational appointment for two years.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two or three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BUTLER. I have made no criticism of the administration of this department, but I am suspicious that the method by which these men are selected is not fair toward other applicants, and, for one, I propose to find out how it has been done.

I do not believe it is just to ambitious young Americans generally to designate an institution and then provide that if one graduates from that institution he shall be admitted to this corps. I am unwilling that this Government should be an advertising agent for any school. I am unwilling that it shall hold out any premium, prize, or reward to a young man to induce him to attend a certain institution that he may have an appointment in the United States service without examination or competition. I believe that all of the young men in the United States who desire to go into military life should have the same opportunity, and that they should not be met in their attempt by exempted graduates of certain institutions in the United States and those institutions designated by any one man.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY]?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Is it not a fact that we have a number of schools throughout the United States where we detail officers as teachers?

Mr. BUTLER. We have many of them.

Mr. CALLAWAY. And where they are supposed to get the same instruction as at West Point?

Mr. BUTLER. I did not hear the gentleman distinctly, and so my colleagues inform me that my answer was not responsive. Military education would not be developed at these institutions like at West Point. The country is filled with institutions. I think there must be 60 or 80 such where young men are taught military duties, and they should have a fair chance with other young men.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Do they not have a fair chance?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not know whether they do or not. It does not seem so to me. The gentleman from Texas knows as well as I do that other educational institutions in the United States—

Mr. CALLAWAY. Why all this discussion without any further facts than just saying here that a few more come from one State than another.

Mr. BUTLER. Three appointments, as the gentleman from Illinois said, out of 32. Three from the Northern States.

Mr. CALLAWAY. How many stood the examination?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not know; but there were 32 appointed. Of the 32, as I understand now, 19 were appointed without examination.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The argument of the gentleman from Tennessee is entirely unsound. He says that these young men were required to show a definite standard before they could be commissioned second lieutenants in the Marine Corps. By whom was the standard judged? By the teachers at this school in Charleston, S. C., known as The Citadel, or by the teachers at some other school. That standard was not reviewed by anybody in the employ of the United States. The Navy Department took the judgment of those teachers in those schools, and yet unquestionably they must be prejudiced judges.

The gentleman compares this exemption from examination with the exemption from examination accorded to certain candidates for West Point who can present a graduation certificate from certain chosen schools. The cases are not parallel. It is a fact, I am sorry to say, that boys are admitted to West Point on the certificate of certain schools at which they prepared. But before those boys can be commissioned in the Army Uncle Sam does not depend on the word of any schoolmasters on earth except his own schoolmasters. There is the distinction between the two cases. In one case young men without any examination are given commissions in Uncle Sam's Marine Corps on the say-so of their own private schoolmasters. In the other case they are admitted to West Point to study for a commission in Uncle Sam's Army on the say-so of their own private schoolmasters, but they do not get any commission until Uncle Sam has found they are qualified to receive it.

Now, another thing. There has been some talk to the effect that these young men from these southern schools are perhaps better prepared than boys from northern schools. Mr. Chairman, we have what is known as the apportionment law in the civil service. The reason for the enactment of that apportionment law is that candidates from the Southern States for the Federal civil service do not get as high passing marks as candidates from the Northern States. The argument which the Civil Service Commission makes in defense of that apportionment law rests on the assertion that the South has not the facilities for adequate schooling, but that in other qualities these southern applicants are superior to the applicants from the Northern States. Never before have I heard anyone contend that in a competitive examination candidates from the Southern States could come within striking distance of candidates from the Northern States. It is not the fault of the South. I realize that this lack of educational facilities was one of the inevitable results of the Civil War. It was the result of their poverty and of the problems that confronted them. This apparent discrimination in favor of South Carolina and Virginia, whether the result of adroit rules or the result of the tipping of the early wink to favored schools, needs investigation.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 25 insert the following proviso:

"Provided, That no part of any appropriation herein shall be used to pay any officer on the active list of the Navy or Marine Corps who shall engage in any private business, either actively or as a consulting expert, or permit any person, firm, or corporation or association to use his name in the conduct of its business."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I will reserve it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in offering the amendment was on account of the statement I made here a few moments ago in regard to men on the active list in the Navy and Marine Corps engaging in active business in the management of concerns or as consulting experts. And it seems to me

that if the Government of the United States pays these men in the active service a full wage the Government should have the entire service of those men in the affairs of the Government, and that those services should not be utilized by any commercial enterprise for the sake of profit.

Mr. PADGETT. I agree with the gentleman as to the general purpose.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. The language of the amendment, as I understood it, applies probably only to the appropriation for the pay of officers in the Marine Corps.

Mr. PADGETT. No; it says "officers of the Navy and of the Marine Corps."

Mr. MANN. Yes; but it is offered as an amendment, apparently, to a provision which covers only the pay of officers of the Marine Corps.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. And hence would not have any effect, if it went into the law, if it applied only to that appropriation, on the pay of the officers of the Navy. But from the way it was read, apparently, it strikes me that it would cover officers on the retired list.

Mr. HICKS. No; officers on the active list.

Mr. MANN. Very well.

Mr. HICKS. I realize, Mr. Chairman, that it does not cover exactly what I intended, and that is why I asked permission of the Chairman to allow a return to the right part of the bill where it could be offered properly, and the chairman thought it best not to agree that it should be done. Therefore I have offered it here.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKS. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. I suggest that the gentleman is not in as bad a position as he thinks. At the end of the bill a limitation can be placed upon all the expenditures in the bill, which would certainly apply to those relating to pay.

Mr. PADGETT. The limitation sought here is broader than the legislation to which it is sought to be affixed, and the objection to it is that it is legislation that ought to be considered and matured carefully by the House. We do not know what the legislation ought to be or what the conflicts might be. I insist that this limitation is offered on legislation respecting the Marine Corps, while the limitation is intended to apply to the Navy as well as to the Marine Corps.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike out of the amendment the words "and of the Navy," so that it will apply only to officers of the Marine Corps.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the proposed modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike from the amendment the words "and of the Navy."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BUTLER. Reserving the right to object, there is no criticism of the Marine Corps. Why, then, try it on the Marine Corps? Why will not the chairman allow us to offer an amendment at the right place?

Mr. PADGETT. We ought to understand it thoroughly. If we understood it and could understand whether it conflicts or not, it might not be objectionable; but offered in this way, without investigation, I do not think it is a good plan of legislation.

Mr. STAFFORD. The bill probably will not be finished tonight. Would the gentleman have any objection to considering it to-morrow?

Mr. PADGETT. If I can see it and ascertain what the substance of it is, and see that it is well grounded, I would not have any objection to well-considered and well-digested legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand that the gentleman from Tennessee makes a point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Tennessee on the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. I think that, so far as striking out the words "and of the Navy" is concerned—and that is the state it is in now, is it not?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the committee agreed that the words as applied to the Navy should be stricken out, which makes it applicable only to the Marine Corps.

Mr. PADGETT. Well, it is useless to put that in. There is no complaint with reference to the Marine Corps. I ask the gentleman from New York to withdraw it so that we can see whether or not something can be prepared that has some merit in it.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I think that is perfectly fair.
Mr. HICKS. With that understanding, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay of enlisted men, active and reserve list: Pay and allowances of noncommissioned officers, musicians, and privates, as prescribed by law, and for the expenses of clerks of the United States Marine Corps traveling under orders, and including additional compensation for enlisted men of the Marine Corps regularly detailed as gun captains, gun pointers, mess sergeants, cooks, messmen, signalmen, or holding good-conduct medals, pins, or bars, including interest on deposits by enlisted men, post-exchange debts of deserters, under such rules as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, and the authorized travel allowance of discharged enlisted men and for prizes for excellence in gunnery exercise and target practice and for pay of enlisted men designated as Navy mail clerks and assistant Navy mail clerks, both afloat and ashore: *Provided*, That the provisions of the act of May 27, 1908 (35 Stats., 417, 418), as amended by the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stats., 560), are hereby extended to authorize the designation of enlisted men of the Navy or Marine Corps as Navy mail clerks and assistant Navy mail clerks with expeditionary forces on shore. In all, \$4,800,532.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege, as a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, to draft the provision of the law authorizing naval mail clerks and assistant mail clerks, so as to enable the enlisted men on our battleships to have the privilege of a better mail service. I wish now to inquire of the gentleman from Tennessee what modification of that law is carried in the paragraph under consideration?

Mr. PADGETT. It does not modify the law that now exists. This simply makes it apply to the Marine Corps. It already applies to the Navy, but does not apply to the Marine Corps. The Marine Corps is the service that does the expeditionary work, as in Haiti and Santo Domingo and Nicaragua, where they go out in advance work. This is simply giving the same privilege to the Marine Corps that is now provided by law for the Navy.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is not the purpose to have an extra man or seaman on each battleship to take care of the mail of the marines on that battleship?

Mr. PADGETT. Not at all. It is simply to allow a man to be designated to perform that duty, one of the enlisted men, so that he may have an official status. It does not involve any pay, or additional men, or anything of that kind.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the original law, I beg to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there was extra compensation provided for those who performed the work of mail clerks and assistant mail clerks.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not remember as to that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, yes. We granted them a small additional compensation. We thought it no more than right, in case they performed this responsible work of distributing the mail, and registering mail, and, I believe, issuing money orders, that they should be compensated for that service, in the main not to exceed \$600, if my memory serves me aright.

Mr. PADGETT. This simply extends to the Marine Corps the same privileges as are now extended to the Navy.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is for that service on land in connection with expeditionary forces, and not in connection with their service on the vessels?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman explain how this mail service is handled? Under this method are the naval forces of the United States permitted to drop a letter into the mail box on board a ship or here on land or anywhere in the world, and then it is transmitted here and a 2-cent stamp is put upon it or a 2-cent stamp put upon it over there? Under this method are members of the naval forces of the United States permitted to drop letters in a mail box on board ship or on land anywhere in the world, and then is the letter transmitted here and a 2-cent stamp put on it, or is a 2-cent stamp put on it over there?

Mr. PADGETT. The mail would be under the general postal laws and subject to the requirements of the postal laws. This is simply to allow a man to act in the capacity of a mail clerk. It does not affect the law or the postage.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. PADGETT. No. That is what I understand that to be. Mr. MANN. Supposing a man in the naval service mails a letter in Shanghai, what postage does he pay?

Mr. PADGETT. As I understand it, he pays the same postage that anybody else would pay under the law regulating that.

Mr. MANN. What is that?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know.

Mr. STAFFORD. Two cents, if it is deposited in the United States post office at Shanghai.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman from Tennessee said he would pay the same as anyone else. What is that? The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is posted.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. MANN. What is the postage from Shanghai to the United States?

Mr. STAFFORD. Two cents.

Mr. MANN. To everybody?

Mr. STAFFORD. It is; and the same from or to the Philippines. The United States has a branch postal station at Shanghai, and the rate of postage is the same, if my memory serves me right.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. If the gentleman will yield, I have received a number of letters from my son, who is superintendent of agriculture in the Philippines, and the postage was always 4 cents on his letters. I do not know what the rate is.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is because the gentleman's son is very considerate and writes him long letters which weigh more than an ounce.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers on amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. GARDNER: On page 50, line 8, strike out "\$4,800,532" and insert "\$5,700,532."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, that amendment would not accomplish anything—

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I should like recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Tennessee because he anticipated that the gentleman was going to make a point of order. If not, the gentleman from Massachusetts, who offers the amendment, is entitled to recognition.

Mr. GARDNER. No point of order lies against this amendment, Mr. Chairman. A point of order would lie if I were to offer a clause which in terms would raise the pay of the men of the Marine Corps. However, that clause will be inserted in the Senate if this amendment increasing the amount of money available for Marine Corps pay is adopted. The amendment which I now offer increases the amount of money available for Marine Corps pay just enough to enable the Navy paymaster to give the enlisted men \$5 per month more each. However, this amendment will not be adopted. Yesterday you voted down a similar amendment which I proposed for increasing the pay of enlisted men of the Navy \$5 per month per man. This amendment is proposed only for the purpose of emphasizing my view that men of the Marine Corps, as well as men in the Navy, ought to have their pay raised \$5 per month per man. The gentleman need not reply, because I expect the amendment to be voted down, and I offer it merely for the sake of uniformity.

Mr. PADGETT. I simply want to state that the pay of the Marine Corps is fixed in the Army appropriation bill. The law provides that they shall receive the same pay as is provided by the Army bill, and to appropriate this additional amount would not accomplish anything.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman realizes that if it were not for the point of order which might be raised everything which we desire could be accomplished in this bill. It makes no difference what the law says at present. If the gentleman raises no point of order and the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union choose to so vote, we can make the pay of members of the Marine Corps \$100 per month per man, irrespective of the present law.

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly; but there is no necessity for it, because in August we authorized an increase in the Marine Corps of 5,000 men, and I understand they have gotten something like half of them already, since the 1st of September.

Mr. GARDNER. That is perfectly true. The increased pay is not needed in the Marine Corps, as it is in the Navy, in order to secure men. We can get men to go into the Marine Corps, because it is the favorite branch of the service. That is no reason why Uncle Sam should take advantage of men's necessities and underpay them.

Mr. TOWNER. Is it not a fact that the pay of the Navy has been fixed not by statute but by departmental orders, the only exception to that being the increase that was made by statute last year, when 10 per cent was added to the pay which they then received?

Mr. PADGETT. That 10 per cent was added in 1908.

Mr. TOWNER. I mean 1908.

Mr. GARDNER. It was added in 1908, and the pay now is \$17.60 a month by statute, though the gentleman is correct as to the origin of the legislation.

Mr. TOWNER. It is not fixed by statute even at \$17.60.

Mr. GARDNER. It was increased by statute 10 per cent over what it was at the time the statute was passed; that is, \$16 per month.

Mr. TOWNER. And that was fixed by departmental order.

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER]. The amendment was rejected.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has referred to certain appointments in the Marine Corps from the States of Virginia and South Carolina. At the time that his statement was made I had no information on the subject, so I undertook to call the Secretary of the Navy's office. I found that the Secretary was absent; but in conversation with Gen. Barnett, the commandant of the Marine Corps, I have secured some information, which will be supplemented in a few minutes by a written statement from Gen. Barnett, and which I ask permission to place in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. Gen. Barnett states over the phone that last year he called this matter to the attention of the Secretary, and that the Secretary called the different bureaus together to consider the suggestion which he—Gen. Barnett—made, and as a result of such conference 12 or more distinguished schools, widely scattered, were written to for a list of graduates answering certain requirements.

Gen. Barnett conducted the correspondence, and informs me that from some of the schools no responses were received. The names submitted by the presidents of these different schools were carefully considered, and from such lists the selections were made. He assures me there was absolutely no discrimination, and that every name submitted was considered; and, so far as he knows, no complaints have been registered, either as to the method of selection or the young men selected.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. I will.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman inform us whether any inquiry was made as to the nature of the examination given at these schools?

Mr. OLIVER. My understanding is that there was a full inquiry made by Gen. Barnett, and that a certain standard was fixed which all applying for admission were required to meet.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I ask whether the examination papers as conducted at the school reached the Marine Corps here for its official recognition?

Mr. OLIVER. I understand that the graduation certificates were sent and also the grades made by such graduates.

Mr. MANN. May I inquire of the gentleman who gave him this information?

Mr. OLIVER. Gen. Barnett himself. He is just back from Haiti, and informs me that he is now preparing a written statement to be sent me on the subject.

Mr. MANN. It does not change the queerness of the situation.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Will the gentleman from Alabama also put in the names of the 12 colleges? I am interested in that.

Mr. OLIVER. I will. In reply to the remark of the gentleman from Illinois, I think all who are familiar with Gen. Barnett are glad to testify to his splendid efficiency as an officer and his high character as a man, and I am sure that any statement which he may make in reference to this matter will have the respectful and thoughtful consideration of every Member of the House.

It will be noted in the statement supplied by Gen. Barnett, and which I will here set out, that the University of Illinois was written to and no reply received. Gen. Barnett informs me, however, that he hopes when this splendid institution is written to again a number of its graduates will be submitted

for consideration. The statement from Gen. Barnett is as follows:

HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS,
COMMANDANT'S OFFICE,
Washington, February 9, 1917.

MY DEAR MR. OLIVER: In connection with your telephonic communication with me this date, requesting information as to how young men designated as second lieutenants, graduates of certain colleges, were appointed, I have to state as follows:

When the naval appropriation bill passed on August 29 last I took the question of filling the vacancies (255 in number) up with the Secretary of the Navy. This matter was brought up at a council meeting with the Secretary and fully discussed. I proposed at this meeting that I be authorized to fill certain vacancies in the Marine Corps by the appointment of graduates of the military colleges designated by the President in general orders each year as "distinguished colleges." After a full discussion of this matter, the Secretary and the whole council decided that, as only a very few graduates of the Naval Academy could be spared, it would be a good thing to fill a reasonable number of the vacancies by the appointment of graduates of these distinguished military colleges. The Secretary of the Navy then authorized me to communicate with the presidents of these colleges and to designate not to exceed 60 of the graduates recommended by the presidents of the colleges. From many of the colleges we received no recommendations whatever, having heard that a great many of their graduates had gone into the Army.

Each graduate authorized to appear for physical examination was required to present his graduating diploma together with a letter of recommendation from the president of the institution, and also numerous letters as to moral character and general standing in the community from which he came. Most of the applications came from the Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va.; the Citadel, Charleston, S. C.; some from St. John's College, Annapolis, Md.; and some from Norwich University, Northfield, Vt. I am appending herewith a complete list of the colleges from which responses were received and also the number of appointments made from the colleges from which recommendations were received.

Some of the young men who appeared for physical examination failed to pass the required test. As I think I stated to you over the telephone, quite a number of the institutions had no recommendations to make; in fact, the majority of the institutions are in this list. In the selection of these young men no influence whatever was used by any human being. The only recommendations made were made by the presidents of the institutions referred to and the Army officers on duty at said institutions. As I stated to you, I would gladly have taken a great many more of the graduates than I was able to get, because, as stated above, I only secured 39 in toto from these institutions.

Before presenting this question to the Secretary of the Navy, I had heard so much of the good qualities of the Virginia Military Institute that I visited that institution last June and spent several days in going over their curriculum and witnessing drills of all kinds and talking with the superintendent and officers on duty there and with many of the cadets. In fact, this visit was the deciding factor which led me to make the proposition to the Secretary of the Navy. In selecting any graduates from one of these institutions the State he came from was never considered. Since these young men were designated we have held examinations all over the United States, at which any young man who made application or made known his desire to appear before the board was allowed to appear, and out of the total number examined (86 in all) only 29 successfully passed for entry into the Marine Corps from civil life. In this connection, I sent over 1,400 letters to young men all over the country who had in any manner requested information as to how he might get a commission in the Marine Corps. This 1,400 included the names of all young men recommended for appointment from any source.

Of the young men who have already been commissioned from these designated military schools, they have been ordered to duty at once in Haiti and Santo Domingo, and a late inspection of the Marine Corps posts in these countries developed the fact that these young men are doing unusually well and their commanding officers speak in the highest terms of them. Candidates from civil life, without such preliminary training at a military school, have to be sent to our school at Norfolk for 18 months before they can be assigned any military duty. Therefore, it may be seen that appointments from these designated colleges give far better returns to the Government than would be possible without the military training they have received.

I wish to reiterate here what I stated above, that in the selection or in the attempt to get designations from the different colleges, every college in the United States designated as a "distinguished college" by the President was given no favoritism of any kind, and no influence of any kind by word or letter was ever used or presented by any individual, nor was the slightest attention paid to the section of the country from which these young men came, the only requisite being that they should be graduates of these well-known distinguished colleges, and I wish to unhesitatingly state that in my opinion it is the best possible means of procuring second lieutenants, excepting graduates of Annapolis and West Point.

In accordance with the above procedure we have secured altogether 39 graduates of these institutions, but so far have been unable to obtain the authorized number, which, as I stated above, is 60.

Thanking you for your interest in this matter, and with kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely, yours,

GEORGE BARNETT,
Major General, Commandant.

Hon. WILLIAM B. OLIVER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MILITARY COLLEGES DESIGNATED BY THE WAR DEPARTMENT IN ITS GENERAL ORDER OF JUNE 16, 1916, AS "DISTINGUISHED COLLEGES."

University of California, none.
University of Illinois, none.
Kansas State Agricultural College, 1.
St. John's, Annapolis, Md., 3.
University of Minnesota, none.
University of Missouri, none.
Cornell University, none.
The Citadel, South Carolina, 20; 1 since killed in action.
Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, none.

University of Vermont and State Agricultural College, none.
Virginia Military Institute, 12.
Norwich University, Vt., 3.
University of Wisconsin, none.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of getting the floor. Mr. Chairman, without entering into the merits of the controversy raised on this point, I think in justice to the South Carolina Military Institute I should say a word, while the House is on this subject, concerning that institution.

Last year it was my privilege to be in Charleston and to see the students at the institute, and to inspect what is known as the Citadel, the South Carolina Military Institute. Inasmuch as a question like this has come up on the floor, one who knows about the institution should take the time to say a word in its behalf. I do not take the floor to argue the merits or demerits of the proposition raised here on either side. I think too much sectionalism is raised, anyhow. This institution, I may say, is known as the West Point of the South. There are men attending that school from a great number of States. It is the same with the Military Institute in Virginia.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. I will.

Mr. BUTLER. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Did I understand the gentleman to say that this institution of which he now speaks has a great many students from different States of the Union?

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. I will say that the students are not confined to the State of South Carolina.

Mr. BUTLER. They may not be confined to the State of South Carolina; but do students from other States go to this institution?

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. I know they do, but I can not go into the details.

Mr. BUTLER. It seems queer that a boy from your State and a boy from my State could not compete with the boys from South Carolina.

Mr. MANN. If our boys can not stand it with the South Carolinians, they ought not to go.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. There were two hundred and fifty-odd students at that institution. Lieut. Garey, of the Regular Army, is detailed there as instructor.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. How long is the course?

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Four years, the same as in any other college. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to get mixed up in the merits of the proposition raised here. My purpose in taking the floor was to say that in my opinion—and I think it will be borne out by the people who know on both sides as well as the Committee on Military Affairs—that the men who graduate from the South Carolina Military Institute are fitted in every way to enter this branch of the service on the same terms as other men who are educated without going to either the Naval or the Military Academy.

I never saw a finer set of men than at the institute at Charleston. The same applies to the Virginia Military Institute, the Culver Institute in Indiana, the Pennsylvania Institute at Chester, Pa., and the rest of the list that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] referred to, and which I asked him to put in his remarks, and which I think will clear up a good deal of the misconception on this point as to sectionalism. I thought that I ought to mention this South Carolina Institute inasmuch as I have been there and seen what a splendid institution they have and the splendid men educated there. [Applause.] I yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay and allowances prescribed by law of enlisted men on the retired list: For 9 sergeants major, 1 drum major, 23 gunnery sergeants, 37 quartermaster sergeants, 43 first sergeants, 66 sergeants, 21 corporals, 20 first-class musicians, 1 drummer, and 24 privates, and for those who may be retired during the fiscal year, \$175,986.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This item carries \$175,986 for pay of enlisted men and enlisted officers on the retired list. The previous item carries \$198,000 and odd for pay of officers on the retired list. So far as the gentleman knows, has there been any computation made of how many of these officers might be used in active service in case we should get into trouble where we needed trained officers? In other words, many men on the retired list may be retired because of such age that they can not go back and do active service, really, and many men on the retired list have been injured so that they can not do it, but there are many men upon the retired list who would make very useful officers in the active service, at least temporarily, when we need trained men.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, in case of war or emergency, yes; and the Secretary stated, and the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation stated that they had a list, that they had sent to

every retired officer a designation of a specific duty and a specific assignment that was required of him if an emergency arose or if war was declared, and that every one of these retired officers has in his possession instructions which, of course, are confidential, as to what designation and what assignment he would have, the moment he was notified of the necessity of his service, and he would go directly and report for that duty.

Mr. MANN. I do not see how it could do any injury to make a statement as to the number of these officers who might be used in active service. I asked whether the gentleman had any such computation.

Mr. PADGETT. No; I have not the number. I have what is declared to be the status of the matter, that they have all of these officers assigned and that they have their instructions where to go. I can not give the gentleman the number.

Mr. MANN. We have complaint all of the time that they have not enough officers in the Navy, and we are requested to increase the number of officers. Why do we not know, so far as this emergency is concerned, how many we will have?

Mr. PADGETT. The statement was made here this afternoon. The list of retired officers is published in the Navy Register.

Mr. MANN. I know, but many of them can not possibly go to sea.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. I just want to say to the gentleman that my understanding is that every retired officer has been asked to indicate to the Navy Department what work he considers himself fit and able to do. I am informed that they have accordingly made statements to the Navy Department. As to what work they have been designated for in the event of need, I do not know.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman from Kentucky think that the House, or at least the Committee on Naval Affairs, might properly be informed as to the number of men who could be put into real active service in case of emergency?

Mr. SHERLEY. I am not questioning that. It so happened that a rear admiral of the Navy came to me the other day touching another retired officer. He himself is much too old to be able to do any active work, and he spoke of a request of that kind having been made and of the work he thought this particular officer could do with very great benefit to the country. That is the way I came to know of the inquiry being made of them.

Mr. MANN. The wonder to me is that this information is not given to us.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know the number, I can not tell how many out of the 900 could be assigned to active duty.

Mr. MANN. I doubt very much whether the Navy knows; but if they do we ought to know.

Mr. PADGETT. I presume the Navy does know, and I shall try to find out and give the gentleman the information in the morning.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay of civil force: In the office of the major general commandant: One chief clerk, at \$2,000; 1 clerk, at \$1,800; 1 messenger, at \$971.28.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee how many officers we have actively engaged in the Navy at this time. He said there were 900 upon the retired list.

Mr. PADGETT. There are something over 4,000 at the present time, I think. It was something over 3,900, counting the line and the staff, last year, and that, if I remember correctly, was prior to the graduation of the class at Annapolis last year, and I think there were something like 150 or 160 in that graduating class.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Can the chairman give the exact number on the retired list?

Mr. PADGETT. It is published in the register, if the gentleman will look at it.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I want it in the RECORD.

Mr. PADGETT. I can not give the gentleman that. Somebody stated here this afternoon there were about 900. I have not looked it up myself.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know how many of these 900 are admirals and how many admirals we have actually got engaged in active service.

Mr. PADGETT. Counting the extra numbers, there are somewhere between 25 and 30.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Actually engaged in actual service?

Mr. PADGETT. Counting the extra numbers.

Mr. CALLAWAY. How many on the retired list?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know. The gentleman can get that from the register.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the chairman please put in his statement in reply to this question how many rear admirals are on the retired list?

Mr. PADGETT. If the gentleman will just turn to the Navy Register he can get it.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I would rather have it from the chairman.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman can get it.

Mr. CALLAWAY. If I put it in, somebody may question it, but if the chairman puts it in nobody will question it.

Mr. PADGETT. I will try to look it up and put it in.

Mr. CALLAWAY. In connection with this statement.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me to answer the question I have the list here and it says 145 rear admirals on the retired list. This is from January 1, 1916.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. How many on the active list?

Mr. PADGETT. Between 25 and 30. This is not the last Navy Register, though.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the office of the paymaster: One chief clerk, at \$2,000; one clerk, at \$1,500; one clerk, at \$1,200.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I intended to make an inquiry about the paragraph preceding the one which has just been read. This is one of several items for pay of the civil force in the office of the major general commandant—one chief clerk at \$2,000, and so forth.

Mr. PADGETT. What page is the gentleman reading from?

Mr. MANN. At the bottom of page 50 and the top of page 51. I looked around the Chamber when this item was read and wondered I did not see some member of the Committee on Appropriations make a point of order on it and claim jurisdiction. Are not these employees engaged in the office of the commandant general here in Washington?

Mr. PADGETT. They are in the office here in Washington, and they have always been carried in this bill.

Mr. MANN. The paymaster is in Washington?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. The adjutant and inspector is in Washington?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. The quartermaster is in Washington?

Mr. PADGETT. These are all here in the department, but some of these are—

Mr. MANN. The Committee on Appropriations has been very energetic lately insisting upon jurisdiction over items of this character so that I am surprised they do not take charge of it now. However, it was my sympathies to these men which caused me to make this inquiry. If these employees were cared for on the legislative bill, those who draw salaries under \$1,800 a year would probably get an increase, certainly would get an increase if the salaries were under \$1,000. There might be some at that rate. I think there is one carried in this bill, but as it is they will get no increase of salary at all. This will be one time when the clerks will want to be carried in the legislative bill. Heretofore they have wanted to stay in this bill, and they have stayed in this bill, and the result will be they will have to be a little more economical the next fiscal year than the other clerks under similar circumstances.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I was called out of the Hall a moment ago and just as I entered the Hall I understood the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] and other gentlemen were discussing the proposition as to how many officers were on the retired list who the Navy Department could call to the colors.

Now, I want to ask the gentleman this question: Whether or not the law now requires the Secretary of the Navy to have men who are on the retired list and yet able to do considerable work to be examined from time to time and be assigned to duty?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir.

Mr. COX. Now, what earthly objections could there be to such laws as that?

Mr. PADGETT. The law provides that men upon the retired list can be called into active duty and receive active pay in the case of emergency or in war. They are all subject to call. In times of any emergency, upon their application, the Secretary of the Navy may assign them to duty and they receive the pay not exceeding that of a lieutenant commander, unless it is their own retired pay. If their own retired pay exceeds that of a lieutenant commander, they receive their own retired pay.

Mr. COX. Now, if the gentleman will yield further. Evidently there is some necessity, for the gentleman from Virginia

in the last year's Army reorganization bill reported in the bill this provision, except in the Army bill it applied to Army officers on the retired list, and this, if enacted into a law, would apply to officers of the Navy on the retired list:

That the Secretary of the Navy shall make a list of all officers who have been placed on the retired list for disability and shall cause such officers to be examined at such intervals as may be advisable, and such officers as shall be found to have recovered from such disability or to be able to perform service of value to the Government sufficient to warrant such action shall be assigned to such duty as the Secretary of the Navy may approve.

Now, will the gentleman explain what earthly objection there would or could be to incorporating a provision like that in this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think there is any necessity for it. It is getting along very well.

Mr. COX. I do not know whether it is getting along very well or not. We are appropriating money here.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I can not yield now.

In response to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY], who made the inquiry a moment ago, I have gone to the Navy Yearbook, and I want to put some figures in the RECORD here. There are men on the retired list of the Navy Department—captains, average age 55, 16; commanders, with an average of 50, 19; commanders, with an average age of 45, 25; lieutenant commanders, with an average age of 45, 27; lieutenants, 27; lieutenants (junior grade), 22; ensigns, 27; passed assistant surgeons, 12; assistant surgeons, 6; paymasters, 8; passed assistant paymasters, 1; naval constructor, 1; assistant naval constructor, 1; or a total of 202.

Now, of those higher grade officers, their average age is 45. Then, in the Marine Corps there is 1 lieutenant colonel, whose age is 50, on the retired list. There are 4 majors, with an average age of 45, on the retired list; 17 captains; 10 first lieutenants; and 3 second lieutenants; or a total of 35. Noncommissioned officers, who are retired with rank of a commissioned officer, chief, 8; boatswain, 10; chief gunner, 4; gunner, 12; or a total of 34.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Why is it that a person of 45 years of age is put on the retired list?

Mr. COX. You can search me. I do not know why. I can point out to the gentleman here in the city of Washington a man on the retired list, a graduate at Annapolis, who is now drawing \$3,000 a year in the active practice of medicine, and there is another man, a graduate of Annapolis, who is now drawing \$3,000, retired pay, and at the same time drawing a salary from the Government of about \$1,400 a year in the United States Subtreasury at Philadelphia. If I had time I could enumerate case after case like that.

And yet, with an appropriation bill here amounting to nearly \$500,000,000, building ships on top of ships, if we are short of anything in the world, it is of officers; and what objection the Navy Department can have to incorporating an amendment such as the one carried on the last Army reorganization bill, that would compel the Secretary of the Navy to examine these officers on the retired list and where they are able to do some work compel them to quit private employment and serve their country after the country has educated them is beyond my comprehension.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. TALBOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. TALBOTT. These people are not placed on the retired list until after they are examined.

Mr. COX. Yes; and they get well mighty quick after being placed on the retired list. They are able to do a good day's work in private employment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not like to have that compliment paid to me when I rise to address the committee.

Mr. PADGETT. I did not want to slight the gentleman. I simply want to get through with this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I want to reply to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] as to the need of having these departmental clerks included in this appropriation bill. I realize, and everybody else realizes, that it is in consonance with good legislative practice to have all the clerks in the departments here in Washington included in one bill. It is the only method that can be pursued in order to deal fairly and equitably with all concerned. I think it would be even better in the interest of good parliamentary procedure and for legislative convenience if the clerks in the Agricultural Department were brought within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations and included in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

Last year it was brought to our attention during the consideration of the Army appropriation bill that there were some departmental clerks in connection with the office of the Chief of Staff that are utilized here in Washington.

Mr. PADGETT. These are of the same character.

Mr. STAFFORD. There was some understanding that they should be included in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. We attempted that this year, not with a desire to appropriate to ourselves legislation that applies to another committee, but with the sole purpose of having one rule applicable to all the clerks in the department. But when we did that this year the Committee on Military Affairs strongly resented our policy and came into the House and objected to their inclusion, and, on a fine technical parliamentary point, they were eliminated from the bill.

I would like to inquire of the chairman of the Naval Committee whether there is any need of having these clerks connected with the departmental offices here in Washington included in the naval appropriation bill?

Mr. PADGETT. I will say to the gentleman—

Mr. STAFFORD. I may say to my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] before the gentleman replies, that we did not attempt to have these clerks stricken out of this bill this year because we realized that the department would be without any clerks at all if we did. The legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill is already in conference. We could not provide for them otherwise.

But I wish to direct an inquiry of the chairman now as to whether, in the formation of next year's bill, it would not be better for legislative purposes to have the clerks provided for in these four paragraphs included in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill?

Mr. PADGETT. I think not. I think they ought to be under the control of the Naval Committee and in the naval bill, because they perform naval service, and they are under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, and right in the offices performing largely naval service.

Mr. STAFFORD. Wherein are they more under the naval officers than the clerks carried in the legislative, executive, and judicial bill connected with the Bureau of Navigation and the Bureau of Construction and the Bureau of Yards and Docks?

Mr. MANN. Or in the office of the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. STAFFORD. Or the office of the Secretary of the Navy? All the activities of the Navy other than this one, are included, so far as the departmental clerks are concerned, in the legislative, executive, and judicial bill.

Mr. PADGETT. They have always been appropriated for in this bill, time out of mind.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is that the only argument the gentleman can advance in favor of their retention in this bill? If he can not advance any other one, I will be tempted to call attention to the subject when the next legislative bill is considered for the sake of consistency and harmony to have these clerks carried in that bill.

Mr. PADGETT. I suppose in that event you would meet the same difficulty that you met on the Army bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, we might meet more. The Navy is much more potent with the big guns than the Army is with its little guns. But that, nevertheless, would be as good an argument in favor of the retention of these clerks in the naval appropriation bill as the members of the Committee on Military Affairs advanced in connection with the retention of those clerks connected with the office of the Chief of Staff.

Mr. PADGETT. I think we have all the arguments they had.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman may have something up his sleeve that he is withholding, but I am tempted to call the bluff, and ask to have them included in the next legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the office of the quartermaster: One chief clerk, at \$2,000; 1 clerk, at \$1,800; 1 clerk, at \$1,500; 2 clerks, at \$1,400 each; 2 clerks, at \$1,200 each; 1 draftsman, at \$2,200.

Mr. MANN. I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. What is the occasion for increasing the salary of this draftsman from \$1,800 to \$2,200? That seems an odd increase.

Mr. PADGETT. The reason he was increased was because he was offered that amount in another employment, and the department said he was a very valuable man, and they did not want to give him up.

Mr. MANN. He will probably be offered \$2,500 or \$3,000 next year, because private employers will pay, for particular men, more than the Government can pay, because the Government must pay more or less on a dead level between men.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; but that is one of the services in the department where they are continually on a stress to keep up their necessary number of men.

Mr. MANN. What occasion do they have for a draftsman at all in the office of the quartermaster under ordinary circumstances?

Mr. PADGETT. They need one over there to do their drafting for their barracks and other work.

Mr. MANN. Have they not learned yet how to construct barracks without making new plans for them?

Mr. PADGETT. They need the man there, and this man was offered \$2,200, and they want to keep him.

Mr. MANN. Undoubtedly he is a competent man, but have they not discovered yet how to construct ordinary barracks without requiring new plans each time they put up a little building?

Mr. PADGETT. They do not always put them up just alike.

Mr. MANN. Why do they not?

Mr. PADGETT. Simply because the necessities are different.

Mr. MANN. I can imagine, of course, that in Nicaragua they may require a building slightly different from a building up in Alaska, but I should think by this time they would have all types. These are not elaborate buildings, or they ought not to be, unless they are constructed for the benefit of a few officers, and I doubt even then whether they ought to be very elaborate.

Mr. PADGETT. The barracks are for the accommodation of the men, and they are built for the accommodation of 500 marines.

Mr. MANN. The barracks accommodate both men and officers.

Mr. PADGETT. I know, but they are the barracks we build for the enlisted men, with a capacity to accommodate 500 men, and that is what we have been providing.

Mr. MANN. Certainly by this time they must have discovered types of buildings, and they must have plans and specifications for them. Of course, I know that to be the case anyhow, or they could not get along with only one draftsman.

Mr. PADGETT. This is the only draftsman they have in the Marine Corps, and they certainly need one. He is a very valuable man.

Mr. MANN. I think they need that many for ornament, so I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I renew the point of order. Do I understand that the committee advanced this man's salary \$400, to the maximum that he could obtain in private employment, and that was the only reason for advancing this salary more than any other advancement carried in this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. It was stated to us that he was worth it, that he was a very valuable man, and that he had been offered \$2,200, and the Marine Corps did not want to lose him.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will inform the gentleman that it has been testified many times before the legislative subcommittee, as a warrant for an increase, that men have been offered fourfold and fivefold the amount of their Government salaries by private employers, yet we did not feel warranted in granting the increase. Mr. Chairman, this is rather an inordinate increase. I would not object to a reasonable increase of a couple of hundred dollars, but to advance a man's salary from \$1,800 to \$2,200 just merely because some private employer thinks he is of value, is not warranted, I think, under the present conditions of the Treasury.

Mr. PADGETT. There is a very great demand for draftsmen.

Mr. KELLEY. The offer this man had was from the Bureau of Yards and Docks, another department of the Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think that only strengthens my position. I think the Bureau of Yards and Docks has more need for draftsmen of this capacity than the Marine Corps. Therefore I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point of order against the figures "\$2,200," and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. Did the gentleman say that he would not object to \$2,000?

Mr. STAFFORD. Upon the information furnished by the gentleman from Michigan that this man is really needed in another branch of the service, I will insist on having it \$1,800.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by inserting the figures "\$1,800."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 51, line 9, insert the figures "\$1,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the office of the assistant quartermaster, Philadelphia, Pa.: One chief clerk, at \$1,800; one messenger, at \$840.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman a question. Why do you allow a messenger at \$840 for Philadelphia and not one at San Francisco?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know just the work that is required there. This is not a new item. At Philadelphia they have a larger establishment, and they manufacture outfits under the Marine Corps.

Mr. SEARS. At San Francisco they have a chief clerk with no messenger, but at Philadelphia they have a chief clerk with a messenger.

Mr. PADGETT. They do not need one at San Francisco.

Mr. SEARS. The chief clerk at Philadelphia has a messenger, and the chief clerk at San Francisco has not, and they both have the same pay.

Mr. PADGETT. The work at San Francisco is not of so diversified a character.

Mr. SEARS. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, pay, Marine Corps, \$7,133,002.78.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, there is a reduction of \$400 in that total. The Clerk has heretofore been given authority to change the totals.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the Clerk has been given authority by the committee to correct the totals.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provisions, Marine Corps: For noncommissioned officers, musicians, and privates serving ashore; subsistence and lodging of enlisted men when traveling on duty, or cash in lieu thereof; commutation of rations to enlisted men regularly detailed as clerks and messengers; payments of board and lodging of applicants for enlistment while held under observation, recruits, recruiting parties, and enlisted men where it is impracticable to otherwise furnish subsistence, or in lieu of board, commutation of rations to recruiting parties; transportation of provisions, and the employment of necessary labor connected therewith; ice machines and their maintenance where required for the health and comfort of the troops and for cold storage; ice for offices and preservation of rations, \$1,676,000. Hereafter no law shall be construed to entitle enlisted men on shore duty to any rations or commutation thereof other than such as are now or may hereafter be allowed enlisted men in the Army: *Provided*, That when it is impracticable or the expense is found greater to supply marines serving on shore duty in the island possessions and on foreign stations with the Army ration, such marines may be allowed the Navy ration or commutation thereof.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. This paragraph carries an appropriation for food or provisions, commutation of rations, and so forth. Is the gentleman from Tennessee able to tell the House the various places outside of the United States where the Marine Corps is now in service?

Mr. PADGETT. At Haiti, San Domingo, Nicaragua, some in the Philippines, some in Guam, some in Hawaii, some in Alaska, and a few in China.

Mr. MANN. Any other foreign countries that the gentleman now recalls?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not recall any at this minute.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman recall how many are in Nicaragua or Haiti or San Domingo?

Mr. PADGETT. Quite a number in Haiti and San Domingo, but not so many in Nicaragua.

Mr. MANN. Any enlisted men in Haiti or San Domingo?

Mr. PADGETT. Quite a number.

Mr. MANN. We gave authority for the officers to recruit a local force there.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; but there are quite a number of enlisted men there in addition to those provided in the legislation that the gentleman refers to, to form a constabulary.

Mr. MANN. If I may judge from current reports, the Marine Corps and the officials are doing excellent service?

Mr. PADGETT. It is so reported, and I have noticed in the press that they are rendering magnificent service.

Mr. MANN. As to Nicaragua, I do not feel quite so sure about it.

Mr. PADGETT. I have not much information about that.

Mr. MANN. In one South American State they had a revolution the other day. Which one was that?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not recall, they come so often.

Mr. MANN. I think it was in one of the States along next to Nicaragua, probably the result of our course in Nicaragua. We have not sent the marines into Costa Rica to restore the Government there that was thrown out? Not yet, as far as the gentleman knows?

Mr. PADGETT. I have not heard of any.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order. Does not the gentleman think it is time for the committee to rise?

Mr. PADGETT. I would like to have the Clerk read a few more pages, down to the increase of the Navy.

Mr. MANN. We can easily finish the bill to-morrow.

Mr. PADGETT. We want to finish the bill and then pass the pension appropriation bill to-morrow.

Mr. MANN. I think it will be hardly possible to do that.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

The following Members were given leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD: Mr. SEARS, Mr. TAGUE, Mr. FESS, and Mr. MORIN.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PAGE of North Carolina, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 20632, the naval appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. GALLIVAN, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for four days, on account of attending the obsequies of a friend.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE ALLEGHENY RIVER, CATTARAUGUS COUNTY, N. Y.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we passed House bill 19298, a bridge bill, where an identical Senate bill (S. 7537) had previously passed the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which we passed the House bill, and then I will ask the House to agree to a resolution to recall the bill from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill H. R. 19298 was passed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. And I ask to have the resolution passed recalling the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 491.

Resolved, That the Clerk be, and he is hereby, directed to request the Senate to return to the House of Representatives the bill (H. R. 19298) entitled an act authorizing the Western New York & Pennsylvania Railway Co. to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River in the town of Allegany, county of Cattaraugus, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 1061. An act to allow additional entries under the enlarged-homestead act;

S. 2222. An act for the relief of the heirs of Antoine Bayard;

S. 5632. An act for the relief of Aquila Nebeker;

S. 5203. An act for the relief of Gardiner L. Eastman;

S. 1553. An act for the relief of Peter Kenney; and

S. 3743. An act to reimburse John Simpson.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following joint resolution and bills:

H. J. Res. 230. Joint resolution authorizing the National Society United States Daughters of Eighteen Hundred and Twelve to file its historical material in the Smithsonian Institution and to make annual reports to the secretary thereof;

H. R. 1609. An act for the relief of S. L. Burgard;

H. R. 6732. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Jennings;

H. R. 7763. An act for the relief of Stephen J. Simpson;
H. R. 11150. An act for the relief of mail contractors;
H. R. 11288. An act for the relief of S. S. Yoder; and
H. R. 11685. An act for the relief of Ivy L. Merrill.

HOURLY MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report upon the bill H. R. 18453, the Indian appropriation bill, for printing under the rules.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1448).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 18453) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 20, 21, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 55, 58, 62, 65, 73, 74, 76, 82, 88, 96, 100, 103, 106, and 112.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 15, 17, 18, 23, 25, 37, 41, 43, 44, 45, 47, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59, 61, 64, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 75, 77, 78, 79, 81, 83, 86, 89, 91, 94, 97, 98, 99, 101, 102, 104, 105, 107, 108, and 109, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "Provided further, That \$5,000 of the above amount shall be used for an investigation and report on the merits of the claim of the Indians of the Warm Springs Reservation in Oregon to additional land arising from alleged erroneous surveys of the north and west boundaries of their reservation as defined in the treaty concluded June 25, 1855 (12 Stats. L., p. 963), and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make such survey or resurveys as may be necessary to complete said investigation and report"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "Provided, That automobiles or any other vehicles or conveyances used in introducing, or attempting to introduce, intoxicants into the Indian country, where the introduction is prohibited by treaty or Federal statute, whether used by the owner thereof or other person, shall be subject to the seizure, libel, and forfeiture provided in section 2140 of the Revised Statutes of the United States"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following:

"For construction, lease, purchase, repair, and improvement of school and agency buildings, including the purchase of necessary lands and the installation, repair, and improvement of heating, lighting, power, and sewerage and water systems in connection therewith, \$400,000: *Provided*, That of this amount \$300 may be expended for the purchase of a perpetual water right and right of way across the lands of private individuals, for the purpose of running a pipe line from a certain spring or springs located near the Sisseton Indian Agency buildings, South Dakota, to said buildings, the purchase of such water right to include sufficient land for the construction of a small cement reservoir near such spring or springs for the purpose of storing the water so acquired: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$500 of the amount herein appropriated may be used for the acquisition on behalf of the United States, by purchase or otherwise, of land for a site for the Mesquakie Day School, Sac and Fox, Iowa: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to allow employees in the Indian Service

who are furnished quarters necessary heat and light for such quarters without charge, such heat and light to be paid for out of the fund chargeable with the cost of heating and lighting other buildings at the same place: *And provided further*, That the amount so expended for agency purposes shall not be included in the maximum amounts for compensation of employees prescribed by section 1, act of August 24, 1912."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "Provided further, That where practicable the transportation and expenses so paid shall be refunded and shall be returned to the appropriation from which paid"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "\$475,000, of which sum not less than \$75,000 shall be used for the employment of additional field matrons"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of said amendment strike out the figures "\$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$8,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in line 1 of said amendment insert "\$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of said amendment numbered 24 and the following language appearing in lines 10 to 14, inclusive, on page 13 of the bill:

"That from and after the passage of this act the Secretary of the Interior shall have the power to authorize any superintendent, clerk, or other employee in the Indian field service to administer oaths and take acknowledgments in connection with matters pertaining to their official duties."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the amendment proposed, after the word "Interior," strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "reimbursable to the United States from any funds now or hereafter placed in the Treasury to the credit of the Navajo Indians in Arizona, to remain a charge and lien upon the lands and funds of said tribe of Indians until paid"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following:

"That section 3 of the act of January 12, 1891 (26 Stat. L., p. 712), entitled "An act for the relief of Mission Indians in the State of California," be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to authorize the President, in his discretion and whenever he shall deem it for the interests of the Indians affected thereby, to extend the trust period for such time as may be advisable on the lands held in trust for the use and benefit of the Mission Bands or villages of Indians in California."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following:

"IOWA.

"SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to pay to the enrolled members of the Sac and Fox of the Mississippi Tribe of Indians of the State of Iowa, entitled under existing law to share in the funds of said tribe, or to their lawful heirs, the sum of \$10,334.96, together

with the interest which has or may hereafter accrue thereon, remaining in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Sac and Fox of the Mississippi Tribe of Indians of the State of Iowa, from the sum of \$42,893.25 transferred to the credit of those Indians under the provisions of the act of June 10, 1896, said sum of \$10,334.96 to be apportioned per capita among the enrolled members of said tribe."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 6 of the amendment strike out the following: "for setting out trees, \$500"; and in line 7 of the amendment strike out the figures "\$75,175" and in lieu thereof insert the figures "\$74,675"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the amendment strike out the word "on" after the word "bridge" and insert the following: "across the Mississippi River on the"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 5 of the amendment, after the word "been," strike out the words "omitted erroneously from the rolls," and in lieu thereof insert the following: "heretofore erroneously stricken from the rolls and reinstated prior to the passage of this act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "Washington," in lines 21 and 22 of the amendment, insert the following: "and other Chippewa Indians visiting said city"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 3 and 4 of the amendment, strike out the following, "for the purchase of additional land, \$41,600; in all, \$129,920," and insert the following: "in all, \$88,320"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the amendment strike out the figures "\$52,100," and in lieu thereof insert the figures "\$50,430"; and in line 4 of the amendment strike out the figures "\$99,100," and in lieu thereof insert "\$97,430"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following:

"For the construction of a steel bridge across the San Juan River in San Juan County, State of New Mexico, at the best and most available location west or southwest and near to the town of Farmington, in said county and State, \$25,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, and to be reimbursable from any funds now or hereafter placed in the Treasury to the credit of the Navajo Indians in the State of New Mexico."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following:

"That the sum of \$5,000, to be immediately available, be, and the same is hereby appropriated, out of any funds of the Chickasaw Nation, not otherwise appropriated, to reimburse Douglas H. Johnston, governor of the Chickasaw Nation, for extra expenses incurred in the performance of his duty as chief executive of the Chickasaw Nation and principal chief of the Chickasaw Tribe of Indians during the period covered between the years 1907 and 1912, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to make such payment from the funds of said Nation."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the proposed amendment, after the word "Congress," strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following: "Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to pay each and every duly enrolled citizen of the Creek Nation who has not been allotted lands in said nation and

who is not included in Senate Document No. 478, Sixty-third Congress, second session, the sum of \$1,040 in lieu of an allotment of land in said nation. Said sum of \$1,040 to be paid to each and every person out of the funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Muskogee Creek Nation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 7 of the amendment strike out the following: "\$40,000; in all, \$162,200," and insert "\$30,000; in all, \$152,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 12 of the amendment, after the word "prescribe," strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following: "Provided, That the application of this provision shall not interfere with any rights guaranteed by treaty to any allotted Umatilla Indian or Indians"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed insert the following:

"Sec. 21. For support and education of 365 Indian pupils at the Indian school at Flandreau, S. Dak., and for pay of superintendent, \$62,955; for general repairs and improvements, \$8,000; for new barn, \$3,000; in all, \$73,955."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "in all, \$53,750." On page 40, line 1, of the bill, after the figures "\$43,750," insert the following: ", of which amount not exceeding \$900 may be expended for the purchase of two new busses"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following:

"Sec. 26. That until the meeting of the Sixty-fifth Congress, those members of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House of Representatives, not less than five in number, who are Members elect to the Sixty-fifth Congress, are authorized to conduct hearings and investigate the conduct of the Indian Service, at Washington, D. C., and elsewhere, and the sum of \$15,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available and remain available until expended, is hereby appropriated for expenses incident thereto. The said committee is hereby authorized and empowered to examine into the conduct and management of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and all its branches and agencies, their organization and administration, to examine all books, documents, and papers in the said Bureau of Indian Affairs, its branches or agencies, relating to the administration of the business of said bureau, and shall have and is hereby granted authority to subpoena witnesses, compel their attendance, administer oaths, and to demand any and all books, documents and papers of whatever nature relating to the affairs of Indians as conducted by said bureau, its branches and agencies. Said committee is hereby authorized to employ such clerical and other assistance, including stenographers, as said committee may deem necessary in the proper prosecution of its work: *Provided*, That stenographers so employed shall not receive for their services exceeding \$1 per printed page."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the amendments of the Senate numbered 48, 80, 95, and 111.

JNO. H. STEPHENS,

C. D. CARTER,

P. D. NORTON,

Managers on the part of the House.

HENRY F. ASHURST,

H. L. MYERS,

MOSES E. CLAPP,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The bill as it passed the House carried appropriations as follows:

Gratuity	\$7,152,896.67
Reimbursable	2,697,700.00
Treaty	845,360.00
Total	10,695,956.67

The bill as it passed the Senate carried appropriations as follows:

Gratuity	\$8,395,746.67
Reimbursable	3,157,000.00
Treaty	845,360.00

Total	12,398,107.67
-------	---------------

The bill as agreed upon in conference carries appropriations as follows:

Gratuity	\$7,778,176.67
Reimbursable	2,905,500.00
Treaty	845,360.00

Total	11,529,036.67
-------	---------------

The above figures do not include amendments Nos. 80, 95, 111, and 112, which are in disagreement.

The estimates for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, were \$12,230,356.67. The bill as agreed upon in conference, exclusive of the amendments above enumerated on which there is a disagreement, is \$701,320 less than the estimates of the department and \$869,071 less than the bill carried when it passed the Senate.

The Senate conferees have receded on the following amendments: 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 20, 21, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 55, 58, 62, 65, 73, 74, 76, 82, 88, 92, 96, 100, 103, 106, and 112.

The House conferees have receded unqualifiedly on the following amendments: 15, 17, 18, 23, 25, 37, 41, 43, 44, 45, 47, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59, 61, 64, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 75, 77, 78, 79, 81, 83, 86, 89, 91, 94, 97, 98, 99, 101, 102, 104, 105, 107, 108, and 109.

The effect of the recession of the House conferees on the amendments on which they have unqualifiedly receded is as follows:

On No. 15: Provides for three warehouses in the Indian Service instead of two permanent warehouses in last year's law.

On No. 17: Makes \$5,000 of the \$135,000 appropriation for general expenses of the Indian Service immediately available.

On No. 18: Allows six Indian Service inspectors an increase of \$1 in per diem expenses when actually employed on duty in the field.

On No. 23: Requires land purchased by the United States for day school or other administrative purposes to be sold to the highest bidder when any sale is made as contemplated by the law.

On No. 25: Amends the act of March 11, 1904, so as to permit of temporary rights of way for pipe lines across Indian lands for the conveyance of oil and gas.

On No. 37: Provides for the erection of a new school at the Fort Bidwell Indian school, California, and appropriates \$12,000 therefor; also corrects the totals.

On No. 41: Permits the using of the funds arising from the sale of lands on the Klamath Indian Reservation for the purpose of constructing roads, trails, and other improvements for their benefit in addition to the purposes set forth in the act of June 17, 1892.

On No. 43: Corrects the section number.

On No. 44: Grants an increase of \$2,000 for general repairs and improvements at the Indian school, Kickapoo Reservation, Kans.

On No. 45: Appropriates \$8,000 for the purchase of additional land at the Indian school, Mount Pleasant, Mich.

On No. 47: Directs the Secretary of the Interior to accept the application of Richard Daeley to enter 1½ acres of land as assignee of Evaline Gallagher, and to issue patent to Daeley on his complying with the requirements of the law relative to making soldiers' additional homestead entries.

On No. 52: Removes the requirement of the act of June 30, 1914, for showing the quantum of Indian blood in the roll that is being prepared of Chippewa Indians.

On No. 53: Corrects the section number.

On No. 54: Does not increase the appropriation, but provides that \$1,000 may be used for the purchase of two automobiles on the Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont.

On No. 56: Increases the appropriation to the amount estimated by the department for the irrigation systems on the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, Mont.

On No. 57: Increases the appropriation for the support and civilization of the Rocky Boy Band of Chippewa Indians in Montana.

On No. 59: Corrects the section number.

On No. 61: Corrects the section number.

On No. 64: Corrects the section number.

On No. 67: Corrects the section number.

On No. 68: Corrects the section number. Also, provides for 10 additional pupils, an assembly hall and gymnasium, and additional land for a school farm at the Indian school, Cherokee, N. C., in accordance with the department estimates.

On No. 69: Corrects the section number.

On No. 70: Provides for the construction and equipment of a gymnasium building at the Fort Totten Indian School, North Dakota.

On No. 71: Provides for an assembly hall and employees' cottages at the Wahpeton School, North Dakota, in accordance with the department estimates.

On No. 72: Corrects the section number.

On No. 75: Provides that Osage County, Okla., shall be deemed Indian country within the meaning of acts of Congress making it unlawful to introduce intoxicating liquors into Indian country.

On No. 77: Provides for a reappraisal of Osage County, Okla., and appropriates \$5,000 from tribal funds for such purpose.

On No. 78: Corrects the section number.

On No. 79: Provides that the city of Tishomingo, Okla., shall convey sites for the dormitories for the Murray State School of Agriculture by fee-simple title.

On No. 81: Provides for the payment of M. L. Mott, formerly national attorney for the Creek Nation of Indians, for expenses incurred during the period January 15 to February 8, 1914, when his successor was appointed.

On No. 83: Reinstates existing law providing for a national attorney for the Creek Indians, and authorizes the expenditure of Creek funds to pay for the same.

On No. 86: Corrects the section number.

On No. 89: Provides for the purchase of tracts of land on the Columbia River, Oreg., as fishing grounds for the Oregon Indians, and appropriates \$5,000 therefor.

On No. 91: Corrects the section number.

On No. 94: Merely corrects the language.

On No. 97: Appropriates \$7,500 for the repair and improvement of the road from Canton, S. Dak., to the insane asylum for Indians at that place.

On No. 98: Corrects the section number.

On No. 99: Corrects the section number.

On No. 101: Provides that certain patents issued to certain Indians as fee simple patents under the homestead act of May 20, 1862, be ratified and confirmed as of the dates of their issuance.

On No. 102: Corrects the section number.

On No. 104: Appropriates \$1,500 for the purchase of a storage battery at the Indian school, Tomah, Wis.

On No. 105: Corrects the totals to correspond with amendment No. 104.

On No. 107: Amends the House provision authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to withdraw \$300,000 of the tribal funds of the Menominee Indians of Wisconsin and to spend the same in clearing the land, building of homes, purchase of seeds, machinery, tools, etc., so as to protect the timberlands of the Indians where they seek to farm their allotments by requiring first a survey and certification of the forest service of the Indian Bureau that the lands are more valuable for agricultural purposes than for the preservation of the timber growing on the land. Also the amendment provides for a per capita payment, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, of \$50 to each member of the Menominee Tribe.

On No. 108: Corrects the section number.

On No. 109: Increases the appropriation for the irrigation system within the diminished Shoshone or Wind River Indian Reservation, Wyo., and indicates two partly completed ditches or canals on the reservation where the work shall be completed. The amendment also appropriates \$5,000 additional for the purpose of making further surveys and examinations relative to the irrigation of the conditionally ceded lands on the reservation.

On the following amendments the House conferees receded with modifying or substitute amendments: 2, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 19, 22, 24, 32, 35, 40, 42, 46, 49, 50, 51, 60, 63, 66, 84, 85, 87, 90, 92, 93, and 110.

The effect of the recession of the House conferees on the amendments on which they have receded with modifying or substitute amendments is as follows:

On No. 2: Strikes out the \$5,000 appropriated for the investigation provided for and authorizes and directs the expenditure from the lump-sum appropriation for the survey, resurvey, classification, and allotment of lands to Indians.

On No. 5: Provides that automobiles used in introducing or attempting to introduce intoxicating liquor into Indian country in violation of law shall be subject to seizure, libel, and forfeiture as provided in section 2140 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

On No. 9: Decreases the amount allowed by the Senate for the support of Indian day and industrial schools from \$1,650,000 to \$1,600,000.

On No. 10: Decreases the amount allowed by the Senate for the construction, lease, and repair of school and agency buildings from \$625,000 to \$400,000 and restores two provisos as estimated for by the department.

On No. 11: Provides that when expenses for transportation and collection of pupils have been refunded that they shall be returned to the appropriation from which paid.

On No. 12: Decreases the appropriation for industrial work among the Indians from \$500,000, as it passed the Senate, to \$475,000, and provides that \$75,000 of this amount shall be used in the employment of additional field matrons.

On No. 16: Decreases the appropriation for pay of judges of Indian courts from \$10,000 to \$8,000 and provides that no part of this money shall be expended for any judge for the Pueblo Indians in New Mexico.

On No. 19: Decreases the appropriation for industry and self-support among the Indians from \$450,000, as it passed the Senate, to \$400,000.

On No. 22: Decreases the appropriation for reimbursing Indians for loss of stock infected with dourine and other contagious diseases from \$100,000, as it passed the Senate, to \$75,000, and provides that the same shall be immediately available and remain available until expended.

On No. 24: Strikes out both the Senate and House provisions authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to empower any employee in the Indian Service to administer oaths and take acknowledgments in connection with matters pertaining to their official duties.

On No. 32: Provides that the appropriation for the construction of two bridges near the Leupp Indian Agency, Ariz., shall be reimbursable from any funds now or hereafter placed to the credit of the Navajo Tribe of Indians in the Treasury of the United States.

On No. 35: Decreases the appropriation for the purchase of lands for homeless Indians in California from \$25,000, as it passed the Senate, to \$20,000.

On No. 40: Authorizes an amendment to the act of January 12, 1891, so as to enable the President to extend the trust period on the lands held in trust for the use and benefit of the Mission Bands of Indians in California.

On No. 42: Directs the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, to make a per capita payment to the enrolled members of the Sac and Fox of the Mississippi Tribe of Indians in Iowa.

On No. 46: Authorizes certain expenditures for the support and education of 225 Indians at the Indian school, Pipestone, Minn., including a domestic-science cottage, an addition to the hospital, a central heating plant, and for road and drainage, and decreases the total appropriation for this school from \$75,175, as it passed the Senate, to \$74,675.

On No. 49: Authorizes the expenditure of \$5,000 of the funds of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota for the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River, Cass Lake Reservation, Minn., upon condition that Congress shall hereafter appropriate \$10,000 to be contributed to the Forestry Service, and that the State of Minnesota, or the local Minnesota authorities, shall also contribute \$10,000 for the construction of such bridge.

On No. 50: Authorizes the payment from Chippewa Indian funds to persons whose names had been erroneously stricken from the rolls of the Chippewa Indians and had been reinstated prior to the passage of this act.

On No. 51: Appropriates \$6,000 of the funds of the Chippewa Indians for the expenses of the general council of such tribe to be held at Bemidji, Minn., and also the necessary expenses of delegations of Chippewa Indians when attending to the business of the tribe in Washington, D. C.; also authorizes a special agent of the Interior Department to attend future meetings of the council.

On No. 60: Authorizes the erection of a steel water tank and employees' quarters at the Indian school at Genoa, Nebr., and decreases the appropriation for the school from \$129,920, as it passed the Senate, to \$88,320.

On No. 63: Decreases the appropriation for the Indian school at Carson City, Nev., from \$99,100, as it passed the Senate, to \$97,430, this decrease being necessary by the action of the Senate conferees in receding from Senate amendment No. 62.

On No. 66: Merely changes the wording of the Senate amendment appropriating \$25,000, reimbursable, for the construction of a steel bridge across the San Juan River in San Juan County, N. Mex., which bridge was shown to be badly needed by the Indians.

On No. 84: Changes the wording of the amendment appropriating \$5,000 from the funds of the Chickasaw Nation of Indians for

the purpose of reimbursing Douglas H. Johnston, governor and principal chief of the Chickasaw Indians, for extra expenses incurred in the performance of his duties as such governor and principal chief between the years 1907 and 1912.

On No. 85: Provides that hereafter no allotments shall be made to members of the Creek Nation of Indians without specific authority of Congress, and authorizes the Secretary to pay to the enrolled members of the Creek Nation who have not as yet received an allotment of lands \$1,040 each in lieu of an allotment, said payments to be made from the funds of the Muskogee Creek Nation of Indians.

On No. 87: Reduces the appropriation for the construction of buildings at the Indian school, Salem, Oreg., from \$40,000, as it passed the Senate, to \$30,000, and corrects the total to correspond.

On No. 90: Authorizes an allotment of not exceeding 80 acres to each Umatilla Indian residing on the Umatilla Reservation, Oreg., who has not been allotted but who has allotment rights on the reservation, so long as the lands remain available for such purpose, and authorizes the issuance of trust patents for the selections so made. Also provides that the application of this provision shall not interfere with rights of the Umatilla Indians as guaranteed by treaty.

On No. 92: Corrects the section number and reinstates the House provision.

On No. 93: Strikes out the specific appropriation of \$900 for two busses at the Indian school, Pierre, S. Dak., and provides that such busses may be purchased from the appropriation for the support and education of the Indians at this school. Also decreases the appropriation for this school from \$54,650, as it passed the Senate, to \$53,750.

On No. 110: Restores the House language providing for an investigation by the members elect of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth Congress, makes the appropriation immediately available and to remain available until expended; also gives the committee authority to examine all books, documents, and papers of the Indian Service, to subpoena and compel the attendance and administer oaths to witnesses, and to employ such clerks and other assistance, including stenographers, as may be necessary for the proper prosecution of its work.

JNO. H. STEPHENS,
C. D. CARTER,
P. D. NORTON,

Managers on the part of the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks upon the naval bill. The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on national prohibition. The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks upon the subject of the necessity for a forest reserve at the headwaters of the Red River, in Texas. The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the Senate amendment to the legislative bill to place postmasters under the civil service. The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the rising cost of living. The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, February 10, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for con-

tingent expenses, Executive Office, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 2044); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Public Printer submitting increased estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 2045); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War, submitting a supplementary estimate of appropriation to be immediately available for the establishment and equipment of a submarine base at the Panama Canal (H. Doc. No. 2046); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 20838) to donate certain condemned cannon and cannon balls to the city of Ironton, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20839) to donate certain condemned cannon and cannon balls to the city of Gallipolis, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 20840) providing for the construction of a public building at Binghamton, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BLACKMON: A bill (H. R. 20841) for the reduction of postage on first-class mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 20842) providing for the registration of designs; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 20843) to authorize a report upon the necessity for the construction of a bridge across the Salt River on the Salt River Indian Reservation, Ariz.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 20844) to establish a United States commission of mediation and conciliation for the purpose of investigating the relations between railroads and their employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SABATH: Resolution (H. Res. 490) providing for telephone service at Capitol after March 31, 1917; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CALLAWAY (by request): Resolution (H. Res. 492) providing for a referendum vote on a declaration of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER: Resolution (H. Res. 493) requesting certain information of the Secretary of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURNETT: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 73) to authorize the printing of 10,000 copies of the immigration law (Public, No. 301), Sixty-fourth Congress; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting suffrage to women; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring amending the Constitution of the United States so that the President may veto single items in appropriation bills; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, urging the appropriation of \$3,000,000 for a naval base upon the Columbia River in Oregon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HAYES: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, favoring the reclamation of arid and swamp lands in the United States; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, favoring the improvement of Crescent City Harbor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, favoring the loaning of a portion of the funds of the postal savings bank directly to public-school districts; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, favoring the holding of a congress of States to consider the sources of revenue with the object of segregation of State and Federal revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, favoring the appropriation of money for the hydrographical

work on the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, favoring the lowering of water level of Lower or Little Klamath Lake; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, favoring the passage of a bill to provide for the construction of a military highway along the north bank of the Columbia River, between Fort Canby and Fort Vancouver; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, urging the appropriation of \$2,612.00 by the United States to reimburse the State of Washington for expenditures in connection with the mobilization of the Washington National Guard; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, favoring the construction and maintenance of military highways along the Pacific coast from the Canadian border to the Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, declaring the loyalty of the people of Connecticut to the Government of the United States in the present international crisis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCARTHUR: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon for the submission of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States whereby the President shall be authorized to disapprove of any items of a bill making an appropriation of money; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SINNOTT: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the President to disapprove of any items of a bill making appropriations of money; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 20845) granting an increase of pension to William H. Kidd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20846) granting an increase of pension to Adam Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHURCH: A bill (H. R. 20847) granting a pension to Leon L. Scott; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 20848) for the relief of Mary White, widow of Benjamin White, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 20849) granting an increase of pension to James Park; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 20850) to correct the military record of Frederick Colburn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 20851) granting an increase of pension to George Gunnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAY of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 20852) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Cloud; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 20853) for the relief of R. M. Blount; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORTH: A bill (H. R. 20854) granting an increase of pension to John Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 20855) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Culbertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20856) granting an increase of pension to Marvin Waldorff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20857) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Jennings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 20858) granting an increase of pension to William N. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SISON: A bill (H. R. 20859) to relinquish, release, remise, and quitclaim all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STINESS: A bill (H. R. 20860) granting an increase of pension to John F. Vaughn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEATON: A bill (H. R. 20861) granting a pension to Harry E. Snyder; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of citizens of Framingham, Mass., asking Congress to submit suffrage amendment to the State legislatures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of Local Union No. 1347, of Pennsylvania, favoring embargo on foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Scranton (Pa.) Supply & Machinery Co., favoring amending section 5 of House bill 8234; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of employees of the Post Office Department, favoring passage of House bill 17806, relative to salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of John Schuette, of Manitowoc, Wis., relative to inviting all warring and neutral nations to a conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, against proposed tax on excess profits of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Fred K. Myer, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 20080, migratory-bird treaty act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, against tax on excess profits of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry farmers in the State of Wisconsin, relative to advance in price of binder twine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of common council of the city of Milwaukee, Wis., relative to discontinuance of the package-freight business; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Borden's Condensed Milk Co., of Belvidere, Ill., against proposed tax on excess profits of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of E. B. Dromgold, of Landisburg, Pa., favoring passage of House bill 18531, to increase pensions of maimed soldiers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers' Union No. 11, of Peru, Ill., opposing any declaration of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of post-office employees of San Francisco and vicinity, favoring House bill 17806, to increase salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Ruthenian National Union, favoring House joint resolution 350, relative to raising funds for the relief of the Ruthenians; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of sundry members of the Massachusetts Branch of the League to Enforce Peace, urging adoption by the United States of the league's proposals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of employees of the Post Office Department, favoring House bill 17806, relative to increase in salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HEATON: Memorial of Schuylkill Commandery, No. 202, Knights of Malta, to forbid public use in parades of any flag except the Stars and Stripes or the State flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Local Union No. 1656, United Mine Workers of America, of Shenandoah, Pa., to place an embargo on foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL: Petitions of sundry citizens of Bridgeport, Conn., favoring passage of House bill 6915, a retirement law for superannuated employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of Local No. 2150, United Mine Workers of America, Maynard, Ohio, favoring embargo on foodstuffs to reduce high cost of living; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KONOP: Memorial of Common Council of Milwaukee, Wis., relative to rates of transportation, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Otto H. Schultz et al., protesting against House bills 17850 and 1898 and Senate bills 1082 and 4429; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of Mrs. William I. Hull, chairman, and Mrs. H. H. Donaldson, corresponding secretary, of the Woman's Peace Party, of Philadelphia, Pa., urging settlement of our differences with Germany by mediation or other peaceful means; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Miss Luella Meloy and 48 other members of the Pennsylvania College for Women, of Pittsburgh, Pa., with reference to the migratory-bird treaty act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIORDAN: Petition of 700 citizens of the State of New York, favoring the Fitzgerald bill for an embargo on foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHOUSE: Petition of 28 citizens of Dillwyn and Christian Endeavor people of Coldwater, Kans., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEGEL: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of New York, favoring a judicious system of indirect taxes, including stamp dues and others; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring any fair and equitable taxation necessary to the protection of American lives and property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of L. O. Miller and 65 citizens of Kalamazoo, Mich., favoring passage of House bill 20204; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, Washington, D. C., affirming its devotion to the program of preparedness and opposing taxation of excess profits of corporations and copartnerships; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of members of the faculty of Mount Holyoke College, relative to the United States taking its part in a league of nations to prevent future wars, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Old Middlesex Chapter, Sons of the American Revolution, indorsing compulsory military training in the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America against proposed tax on excess profits of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Memorial of Local Union 1772 of the United Mine Workers of America, of Palisades, Colo., urging placing an embargo on food products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Papers relating to House bill 20570, for increase of pension for James Mackall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of ex-Confederate soldiers of Simpson County, Ky., for a refund of the cotton tax imposed by the Government during the Civil War; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Memorial of Old Middlesex Chapter, Sons of the American Revolution, favoring compulsory military training in the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America against proposed tax on excess profits of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of members of the faculty of Mount Holyoke College relative to the United States taking its place in the league of nations to prevent future wars; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of 400 Woman's Christian Temperance Union people of Holyoke, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of C. W. Ellington and other citizens of Velva, Bismarck Verein, and sundry citizens of Bismarck, N. Dak., opposing any policies, etc., tending to war, etc., with foreign nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, February 10, 1917.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, we would open the duty of this day by invoking Thy blessing upon us, putting ourselves as willing instruments in Thy hands. We pray for the inspiration that comes alone from God, that out of the consideration of the problems that confront us and the possible dangers that surround us we may gain not only wisdom concerning the things of this life, but a deeper, truer, diviner conception of life itself. May we understand the relationship that the work of this day holds to the never-ending life and the relationship which our lives in their activities here hold to that destiny that knows no end. Guide us with God ever before us as our guide and light and defense. For Christ's sake. Amen.